

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 85-25

H. R. 2367

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 2367.....	1
Digest of Public Law 85-25. . . . .	2





## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 2367

- Jan. 10, 1957 Rep. Poage introduced and discussed H. R. 2367 which was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of bill. Remarks of author.  
Sen. Johnson introduced and discussed S. 511 which was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill. Remarks of author.  
House bills introduced: H. R. 2357, Rep. Albert; H. R. 2358, Rep. Brooks, Tex.; H. R. 2359, Rep. Burleson; H. R. 2360, Rep. Dempsey; H. R. 2361, Rep. Dies; H. R. 2362, Rep. Dowdy; H. R. 2363, Rep. Fisher; H. R. 2364, Rep. Ikard; H. R. 2365, Rep. Kilgore; H. R. 2366, Rep. Mahon; H. R. 2368, Rep. Rogers, Tex.; H. R. 2369, Rep. Rutherford; H. R. 2370, Rep. Thornberry; H. R. 2371, Rep. Wright; H. R. 2372, Rep. Young; H. R. 2514, Rep. Thompson, Tex.; H. R. 2535, Rep. Aspinall; Rep. Edmondson introduced H.R. 2543, all referred to House Committee on Agriculture.
- Jan. 16, 1957 Rep. Teague, Tex. introduced H. R. 3111 which was referred to House Committee on Agriculture.
- Jan. 23, 1957 Rep. Dixon introduced H. R. 3519 which was referred to House Committee on Agriculture.
- Jan. 24, 1957 Rep. Christopher introduced H. R. 3607 which was referred to House Committee on Agriculture.
- Jan. 25, 1957 Sen. Carlson introduced S. 885 which was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.
- Jan. 29, 1957 House subcommittee ordered S. 2367 reported with amendment.
- Jan. 31, 1957 House committee reported H. R. 2367 with amendment. H. Report No. 23. Print of bill and report.
- Feb. 4, 1957 House postponed consideration of H. R. 2367. Reps. criticized USDA position on this legislation. Sen. Symington discussed situation in Missouri. Rep. Breeding introduced H. R. 4259 which was referred to House Committee on Agriculture. Print of bill as introduced.
- Feb. 5, 1957 Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of H. R. 2367. H. Res. 147, H. Rept. 28. Rep. Poage criticized this Department and resigned from special drought committee.
- Feb. 6, 1957 House passed H. R. 2367 as reported. Rep. Martin inserted statement of this Department.

Produced  
was referred to the H  
Print of 1911, Bannock

Feb. 7, 1957. H. R. 2367 was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as referred.

Mar. 4, 1957 Sen. Johnson urged passage of S. 511.

Apr. 3, 1957 Senate committee ordered S. 511 reported with amendment.

Apr. 4, 1957 Senate committee reported S. 511 with amendments. S. Report No. 206. Print of bill and report.

Apr. 8, 1957 Senate passed H. R. 2367 with amendment, inserting the language of S. 511. S. 511 indefinitely postponed due to passage of H. R. 2367.

Apr. 10, 1957 House concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 2367.

Apr. 25, 1957 Approved: Public Law 85-25



## DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 85-25

DEFERRED GRAZING. Provides a deferred grazing program for drought stricken areas. Provides for payments to farmers and ranchers on non-federally owned land for deferred grazing in areas determined by the President to be a major disaster due to drought. Payments will be equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld. Provides that program shall be applicable only to nonfederally owned land which is normally used for grazing. Programs shall remain available for a period of not more than five years after the date of enactment of this Act.





RECEIVED  
H. R. 2367

A BILL





85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2367

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. POAGE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4        tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5        the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6        ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7        amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8        of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9        and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of

1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the ter-  
10 mination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program if  
19 the deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve  
20 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of  
21 livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm  
22 or ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment  
23 to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county  
24 shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such

1 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
2 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated  
11 for the purposes of Public Law 875 Eighty-first Congress,  
12 such funds as are necessary to carry out the program author-  
13 ized herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress  
15 (Act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as follows:

16 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
17 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
18 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875,  
19 Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to  
20 furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
21 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
22 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
23 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
24 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of  
25 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-

1 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
2 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
3 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
4 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities,  
5 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
6 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
7 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reimburse  
8 the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodities  
9 furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
10 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary  
11 in performing such functions."





85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2367

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Poage

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 511

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 10 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas introduced the following bill; which was read twice  
and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of

1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
10 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program if  
19 the deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve con-  
20 secutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock  
21 from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch  
22 results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any  
23 person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall  
24 not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.



1        SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include  
2 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
3 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
4 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
5 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
6 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
7 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
8 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
9 this and any other program concurrently.

10       SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
11 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
12 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
13 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
14 herein.

15       SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
16 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
17 follows:

18       “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
19 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
20 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
21 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
22 to furnish to establish farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
23 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
24 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary

1 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
2 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of  
3 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
4 bination thereof, and the amount recommended by the  
5 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
6 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
7 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel,  
8 facilities, property, and funds of any agency of the United  
9 States Department of Agriculture, including Commodity  
10 Credit Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall  
11 reimburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any  
14 commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers  
15 or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses  
16 necessary in performing such functions."



---

---

# A BILL

---

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

---

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas

---

---

JANUARY 10 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1957  
Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry





# Congressional Record

United States  
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 103

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1957

No. 6

## Senate

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who has promised that if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee, we shall surely find Thee: Thou hast so made us that the glory of our lives can never be beneath us, but always above us. So, from the deep valley of our need for light and guidance, we lift our eyes to the shining peaks that break the far horizons. Even in these fields of time, Thou hast set eternity in our hearts. With that sense of the unseen strong within us, in a clamorous world where the lowest is so commonly the loudest, we bow at this wayside shrine, that the highest may have a chance at our lives.

As this day there is surveyed by the Nation's Chief Executive the state of the Republic and of the agitated world it is called by Thy providence to serve, we commend our country and ourselves into Thy hands, praying that, unworthy though we are, even as we strive eagerly to purge the defects which mar our democracy, Thou wilt use us to defeat the defiling blasphemies which defy Thy kingdom. Nerve us, we pray, for the sacrifices which the better world of our dreams will demand. According to Thy purpose, may the high aims for which we contend come to their final coronation in a brotherhood of nations where justice, truth, freedom, and the sacred dignity of all Thy children shall be secure in all the earth. We ask in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 9, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAGNUSON was

excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate because of official business.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit other resolutions, and transact other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### JOINT SESSION WITH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me express the hope that we shall be able to go to the Hall of the House of Representatives a little after 10 minutes after 12; and some time in the intervening period I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

### REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys at law, signed by Frederick S. Hill, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Washington, D. C., for the year ended December 31, 1956, which, with the accompa-

nying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

### PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the foreign policy of the administration of President Eisenhower; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the enactment of legislation to include Puerto Rico in the Federal program of financial aid for disaster stricken areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the administration's policy on the civil rights program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the administration's program for an increased purchasing power for the labor class, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A translation of a resolution adopted by the 23d Labor Congress, Free Federation of Labor, of Puerto Rico, favoring the administration's plan for Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 511. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)



By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 512. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. NEELY):

S. 513. A bill for the relief of Ines Giacomelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a Federal tax lien shall not be valid, as against a holder of a mechanic's lien, until notice of such tax lien has been duly filed; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 515. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 516. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into and to execute an amendatory contract with the Northport Irrigation District, Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. MALONE):

S. 517. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 518. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries from war-risk hazards or during detention by a hostile force or person; and

S. 519. A bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war-risk hazards and from employment, suffered by employees of contractors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Eleanor M. Horton;

S. 521. A bill for the relief of Fernando Urriza Duralde and his wife, Pilar Ampuero Duralde; and

S. 522. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain from the condemnation by the United States of real property held by a person 60 years of age or older and to provide special treatment for such gain in the case of real property held by a person under 60 years of age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 524. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Gross;

S. 525. A bill for the relief of Rhoda Elizabeth Graubart; and

S. 526. A bill for the relief of Tikva Polsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 527. A bill for the relief of Achille Aquino Fu' Giovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 528. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanaslou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 529. A bill providing for the acceptance by the United States of a conveyance by

the town of Hammond, Oreg., of the military cemetery formerly comprising a part of the Fort Stevens Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 530. A bill for the relief of Shun Wen Lung (also known as Van Long and Van S. Lung); and

S. 531. A bill for the relief of Erika Ohm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 532. A bill to revise and modernize the fish and game laws of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 533. A bill to provide for the inclusion of employees of the Memorial Hospital, Cumberland, as participants in the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. POTTER):

S. 534. A bill to amend section 702 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the construction, reconditioning, or remodeling of vessels under the provisions of such section in shipyards in the continental United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 535. A bill to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 536. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 537. A bill authorizing the Commissioner of Public Housing to convey certain land to the State of Arizona for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 538. A bill to amend Public Law 298, 84th Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 539. A bill directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to study the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California for the piping and pumping of water from the Gulf of California to Arizona for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations;

S. 540. A bill for the relief of the Board of National Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

S. 541. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Emery A. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 542. A bill directing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit retired officers and enlisted men to use available hospital facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 543. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to provide increased punishment for persons convicted of a felony for the fourth time; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 544. A bill to provide for the modification of the authorization for the flood protection project at Jackson Hole, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 545. A bill to amend section 204 (d) of the Small Business Act of 1953 relating to the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## DROUGHT RELIEF FOR TEXAS AND THE SOUTHWEST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have lately returned from Texas, and it is with regret and concern that I announce the continued existence in my State—as well as in the Southwest generally—of an unprecedented and disastrous drought.

In many areas of Texas this drought is now in its 8th year. Many cattlemen have been forced to sacrifice their herds of livestock. Many small farmers have been forced to abandon their land.

Mr. President, the present Federal drought-relief program is inadequate. It does not propose to do enough. What it does propose is too often bogged down in a maze of bureaucratic redtape.

The present disaster in Texas and the Southwest might well become a permanent condition unless we provide a program which not only will give immediate relief where it is needed, but also will enable landowners to give their land an opportunity to recover its former productivity.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill containing a plan for meeting these two pressing needs.

As immediate assistance, this proposal specifically instructs the Secretary of Agriculture to give assistance in providing protein-food concentrates—that is, cottonseed cake. An immediate supply of protein cake is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the range herds of the drought-stricken pasture areas.

The second section of this program is much more far reaching, and is of tremendous long-range importance. It calls for the conduct of an extensive soil-conservation program, through the use of a deferred grazing program.

The present situation is this, Mr. President: The average cattleman finds his pastures almost completely without grass. When the first rain comes, he will be under great pressure to put livestock back on any land where grass will grow. He has many back bills to pay, and he cannot pay them except by putting stock on his land. Yet, it is obvious that this land should be given a chance to recover. Otherwise, large areas of the Southwest may become desert land, unfit for human or animal habitation.

This bill would require the Department of Agriculture to make payments to landowners who will agree to defer the use of their depleted pastures for periods of not less than 1 year. This program would become immediately effective in the drought-disaster area, and would continue for a period of 3 years after the drought has broken. The bill



provides for payments at the normal annual rental value of the land.

Mr. President, this program will make it possible for our hard-hit stockmen to do what they know is sound from a conservation standpoint, but what they cannot afford to do unless an adequate Government program is provided.

I urge upon Members of the Senate their study of this bill and their sympathetic consideration of the problems it would help to solve.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 511) to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE SMALL PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Projects Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1044), to meet what we understand to have been certain objections of the President when he signed the bill H. R. 5381 into law last summer. At that time, it was agreed by sponsors of the measure in both Houses that a proposal to amend the law would be made to the 85th Congress. On those assurances, the President signed the bill, notwithstanding his objection to certain language with respect to possible unlawful delegation of power to congressional committees or an unconstitutional infringement on the separation of powers prescribed by the Constitution.

The language of the bill we are introducing is identical to that of the Watershed Protection Act, Public Law 1018, 84th Congress, approved by the President on August 7, 1956, and to that of the Public Buildings Lease-Purchase Act of 1954, which was approved July 22, 1954 (68 Stat. 518).

In essence, our amendment provides that before an appropriation is made for financial participation by the United States in a small-projects contract, such financial participation shall be approved by the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. Under this amendment, the Congress will exercise financial control over the small-projects program, through its duly constituted committees having jurisdiction.

We trust that in both Houses early hearings will be held on this and similar bills, so that the small-projects program may be gotten underway.

The 17 western reclamation States are intensely concerned with this program, which will contribute greatly to western irrigation stabilization and development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 517) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, intro-

duced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. MALONE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### INCREASED MONTHLY RATES OF COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to raise the level of monthly compensation payments to service-connected disabled veterans and their dependents.

The continued rise in the cost of living has steadily depreciated the present compensation payments to veterans who have suffered disabling injury or illness during military service.

In addition, the present disability payment for the totally disabled, who are so handicapped as to preclude employment of any kind, is at the very low level of \$181 monthly. Such a payment provides far less than is adequate for even marginal living standards, and needs to be given a firm boost even beyond increases designed to take up the slack caused by the rise in living costs.

Consequently increases under this bill range from \$3 a month for the 10-percent disability ratings to an increase of \$69 for the 100-percent disabled. In addition, there are moderate increases in compensation payments for dependents of the disabled veterans, and in the statutory awards.

This proposal has the full support of the Disabled American Veterans, who are intimately familiar with the plight of the service-connected veteran, and who know at first hand the quiet tragedy of men who have sacrificed their health in the service of the Nation.

No group of living Americans deserves greater consideration and respect than our disabled veterans, and it seems to me to be our clear duty to see that they and their families are not permitted to slip into poverty and disillusionment through our failure to see what is happening to them because of the continued rise in living costs.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 535) to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That subparagraphs (a) to (j) inclusive, of paragraph II, part I, Vet-

erans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) If and while the disability is rated 10 percent the monthly compensation shall be \$20.

"(b) If and while the disability is rated 20 percent the monthly compensation shall be \$40.

"(c) If and while the disability is rated 30 percent the monthly compensation shall be \$60.

"(d) If and while the disability is rated 40 percent the monthly compensation shall be \$80.

"(e) If and while the disability is rated 50 percent the monthly compensation shall be \$100.

"(f) If and while the disability is rated 60 percent the monthly compensation shall be \$120.

"(g) If and while the disability is rated 70 percent the monthly compensation shall be \$140.

"(h) If and while the disability is rated 80 percent the monthly compensation shall be \$160.

"(i) If and while the disability is rated 90 percent the monthly compensation shall be \$180.

"(j) If and while the disability is rated as total the monthly compensation shall be \$250."

SEC. 2. (a) Subparagraph (k), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by deleting "\$47" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$55," and the subparagraph is further amended by increasing the maximum rate of compensation set forth therein to \$450 per month.

(b) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (l), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby increased to \$300.

(c) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (m), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby increased to \$350.

(d) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (n), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby increased to \$400.

(e) The rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (o) and the maximum rate payable under subparagraph (p), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are hereby increased to \$450.

(f) The minimum rate of compensation payable under subparagraph (q), paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, for an arrested tuberculous disease, is hereby increased to \$75.

SEC. 3. The basic rate of compensation provided by section 202 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for any disability rated as total is hereby increased to \$250 per month. If and while the disability is rated as partial, the monthly compensation shall be the same percentage of \$200 as the degree of the reduction in earning capacity resulting from the disability but no compensation shall be payable for a reduction in earning capacity rated at less than 10 percent.

SEC. 4. The rate of compensation payable under section 202 (3) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for the loss of the use of both eyes is hereby increased to \$300; the rate payable under that section for the loss of use of both eyes and one or more limbs is hereby increased to \$400; the rate payable under that section for double total permanent disability is hereby increased to \$400; and the additional compensation payable under that section for the loss of the use of a creative organ or one or more feet or hands is hereby increased to \$55: *Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of compensation received hereunder plus the amounts payable under any other provision of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, exceed \$450 per month in any case.



SEC. 5. The additional sum payable under section 202 (5) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for a disabled person in need of a nurse or attendant, is hereby increased to \$80.

SEC. 6. The minimum rate of compensation payable under section 202 (7) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for an arrested tuberculous disease, is hereby increased to \$75.

SEC. 7. (a) Section 1 of Public Law 877, 80th Congress, as amended (38 U. S. C. 740), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, 73d Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 10 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, \$25;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, \$41;

"(c) has a wife and 2 children living, \$53;

"(d) has a wife and 3 or more children living, \$65;

"(e) has no wife but 1 child living, \$17;

"(f) has no wife but 2 children living, \$29;

"(g) has no wife but 3 or more children living, \$41;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then in addition to the above amounts, \$21 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 10 percent, in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability."

(b) Section 2 of Public Law 877, 80th Congress (38 U. S. C. 741), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That any person entitled to compensation at peacetime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph I (c) thereof, and whose disability is rated not less than 10 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents at a rate equal to 80 percent of the additional compensation now or hereafter payable under section 1."

SEC. 8. The increases provided by this act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment.

#### AMENDMENT OF RULE 22—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, again I wish to announce to the Senate, as I have previously, that the resolution proposing an amendment to rule 22, which I submitted, and which is at the desk, will remain there until tonight, in order to give any other Members of the Senate who may so desire an opportunity to add their names to the resolution as cosponsors.

The resolution was submitted jointly by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and myself and other Senators on both sides of the aisle. I believe that at the present time the resolution has more than 33 cosponsors, both Republicans and Democrats. All other Senators are cordially invited to

join in sponsoring the resolution, which will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration at the close of business today.

So I express the hope that any other Senators who desire to join in cosponsoring the resolution will do so.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 7, 1957,

The name of Mr. BIBLE was added as a cosponsor of the following bills, introduced by Mr. MALONE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 39. A bill to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans; and

S. 40. A bill to liberalize the basis for payment; and to increase the monthly rates of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict.

The names of Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. WATKINS were added as additional cosponsors to the bill (S. 86) to provide for an experimental research program in cloud modification, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, on January 7, 1957.

The names of Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. EASTLAND were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 313) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators) on January 7, 1957.

The names of Mr. MORTON, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. McCARTHY were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 83) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators) on January 7, 1957.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Address on the subject of the need for scientific and technical education in the United States, delivered by Senator SYMINGTON before the American Vocational Association at St. Louis, Mo., on December 6, 1956.

Address suggesting a four-point program for education to meet the growing threat of the Soviet Union, delivered by George J. Hecht, on August 16, 1956, and published in Parents' magazine for November 1956.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Sermon entitled "The Race Question," delivered on September 9, 1956, by the Reverend George O. King, minister of the First Methodist Church of East Point, Ga.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Letter entitled "In Western Kansas," written by Ray E. Brewer, of Kanorado, Kans., and published in the Denver Post of January 5, 1957.

#### TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, Friday, January 11, 1957, marks the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, a remarkable man, to whom the United States of America and the State of New York owe much. By proclamation of the President, the entire year beginning January 11, 1957, is designated as the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial. Several appropriate observances have been arranged for the year, by or in cooperation with the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, which was created by the 83d Congress, and of which I have the honor to be a member.

Hamilton is known and justly famed for his pivotal role in the framing of our magnificent form of Government. He is likewise remembered for his success in winning public understanding and approval of the new Constitution through the renowned series of essays known as "The Federalist." Hamilton conceived the notion of The Federalist papers, and wrote most of them. Hamilton is perhaps most famous of all for his enduring accomplishments as our Nation's first Secretary of the Treasury, a post in which he labored with outstanding success to put the Nation's finances on a sound and reputable basis.

Hamilton is remembered by New Yorkers for these accomplishments, of course, but also for some others which are less well known outside the State. It was he who represented New York at the Constitutional Convention. It was his personal leadership which overcame a hostile majority at the New York State ratification convention, and brought New York into the Federal Union.

In 1793, despite his many burdens, Hamilton agreed to serve as a trustee of a school which was being established in New York State, for the education of the Oneida Indians. That school, originally named the Hamilton-Oneida Academy, is now Hamilton College, of which I am proud to be an alumnus and a trustee.

As President Eisenhower said in proclaiming the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial—

Alexander Hamilton served his country well throughout his life.

#### RECENT ATTACKS UPON THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Honorable George Wharton Pepper, once a distinguished member of this body, and for many years a civic leader and outstanding member of the bar of the State of Pennsylvania, has submitted for my attention a statement in reply to recent attacks upon the Supreme Court of the United States.

His statement represents the thinking of a group of American lawyers—100 in number—who reside in 31 States and Territories of the United States. It concerns a matter of great national significance, not only to the legal profession, but to every American citizen.



the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives with Mr. HINSHAW. In addition to serving with him on the full committee, it was also a rare privilege for me to serve with him on the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications. At all times I found him willing to give advice and counsel to me and to the other younger members of the committee upon which we served. He was a true and a loyal friend. He was a man of conviction, a man of sterling character, a man of great and unquestioned integrity. The Nation, the State, and the district which he represented are saddened indeed by the loss of this great American and this great Representative in the Congress.

I join the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] and my other colleagues in this body and on the committee on which we serve in expressing heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Hinshaw and their sons.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my tribute to CARL HINSHAW, with whom I served for 10 years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During all of that period our associations were extremely close. I was with him on all sorts of occasions, pleasant and unpleasant, in periods of relaxation and in periods of strenuous work on the most technical subjects, such as air navigation and the like. So I believe I had as good an opportunity as anybody to form an estimate of CARL HINSHAW's character, his capacity, and his talent.

CARL HINSHAW was an engineer with a mind trained in science. In many ways he brought to our committee a more expert knowledge than any of the rest of us. In the field of aviation, his qualifications have already been mentioned. But in the field of communications he was also exceptionally well versed. I doubt if there has ever served in this Congress a man with a greater comprehension of the problems and the roles of aviation than CARL HINSHAW. When I speak of the problems of aviation, I am thinking not merely of the mechanical and technical problems, but the economic problems of commercial aviation, air routes, and all other matters that could arise in connection with this great new development in transportation.

While our committee has nothing to do with the legislative subject of atomic energy, I was glad that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] mentioned it. I am sure, knowing CARL HINSHAW as I did, that he must have been an altogether invaluable member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In talks which I had with him on that subject I found him more enlightening than anybody else I knew. I had boundless esteem for CARL HINSHAW. Also I had the greatest affection for him. I considered that he was an outstanding legislator in every way. He had a penetrating mind. He mastered any subject he had to deal with. He was a delightful companion, a warm friend, and a most attractive human being. On our Committee on Interstate and Foreign

Commerce, his place will never really be filled. We shall miss him enormously. I personally shall miss him as long as I live and I express my sincerest sympathy to his widow and to his two sons.

(Mr. MCINTIRE, at the request of Mr. HALE, was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that today we do not have with us in person our beloved colleague CARL HINSHAW. His passing seems to us most untimely and has taken from us a man whose wealth of knowledge and a personality sorely needed as we face the challenges of the day.

I looked upon CARL as a veteran legislator and as a younger member looked for guidance in his opinions. He was always most kind to all younger associates and held out to them a helping hand.

Our deepest sympathy is extended to Mrs. Hinshaw and members of the family.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, CARL HINSHAW was one of the first of the senior members of the California congressional delegation with whom I became acquainted when first I came to the House of Representatives. He became one of my finest and most valued of my legislative friends, a relationship which continued until the time of his death.

I join in the many fine tributes which have been made to his abilities. We in California and in the Nation have lost a most valuable public servant and a fine American.

May I also extend the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Allen and myself to Mrs. Hinshaw and the two sons.

[Mr. BEAMER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of CARL HINSHAW. It was my pleasure to serve with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the first 2 years I was in Congress. I found no one more able, willing, and considerate in helping new Members than was CARL.

I should like to add this little poem:  
Life is like a journey on a railroad train,  
With a pair of faces at each window pane.  
I may sit beside you the whole journey through,  
Or I may sit elsewhere, never knowing you.  
But if fate should mark me to sit by your side,  
Let's be pleasant travelers, for life's so short a ride.

It was my pleasure to sit by CARL. I always found CARL a very entertaining, a very considerate, and a very fine traveling companion. I shall miss him, and I want to express to his widow and to his two sons my deep sympathy in the loss of one of our truly great Congressmen.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep feeling in the passing of CARL HINSHAW. It is with heavy hearts that the California delegation has taken this day to pay tribute to one of our former colleagues, CARL HINSHAW, who was taken from us last year. He served his State and Nation so well over the past several sessions in the House of Representatives. CARL HINSHAW was the ranking Member of the Republican delegation from California. He gave freely of his great knowledge and experience to those of us who came later as Representatives from California. His knowledge of engineering, aviation, and atomic energy was of great assistance and aided his colleagues in much legislation dealing with these subjects. He was always willing and able to confer with us personally and with the delegation as a whole. And we shall greatly miss him in our deliberations. His passing is a great loss to his District, our State and our Nation. I desire to express to his bereaved family my sympathy in their great loss. May they take some measure of comfort at least in the knowledge that he lived a useful life, dedicated to the service of his beloved country.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be reconciled to the fact that CARL HINSHAW has gone. This House will feel his loss keenly in days to come.

I came to know CARL HINSHAW as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and as a fellow member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications. To know CARL HINSHAW was to love and to respect him. I join his many, many friends in this body, in the State of California, and throughout the Nation in paying tribute to his beloved memory and in extending sympathy to his family.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the Members of the House who have expressed their sentiments on this occasion concerning our beloved, departed colleague from the delegation from California, CARL HINSHAW. We feel he has made a great contribution here that will be difficult to fulfill. We wish his successor, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], the best of everything, but we also realize that the services of Mr. HINSHAW were an asset to the Congress that are going to be very difficult to replace.

#### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS IN FEDERAL BUDGET PRACTICE

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing as one of my first bills in this Congress, a measure I am deeply interested in and which would further carry out legislation I introduced in the last Congress. This bill would place the entire Federal budget on an annual-accrued-expenditure basis, and



would further implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for a modernization of financial management in the Federal Government. This measure would provide a more informative basis for the enactment of appropriations by the Congress and would reduce, or eliminate, the large carryover of balances of appropriations from one fiscal year to the next. It would certainly give the Congress a better yardstick for measuring Government spending, and it has been estimated to save billions of dollars annually when in full effect.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the result of many months of analysis and research by experienced personnel in the General Accounting Office, Department of the Treasury, and Budget Bureau. It has received vigorous bipartisan support, and has received the strongest endorsement of the highest financial officers of the Government, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

It is my earnest hope that the Congress will act favorably on this legislation.

#### DROUGHT AREAS IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have had the sad experience of knowing some individual who suffered with cancer or with some other incurable disease and have had to see that individual gradually waste away. We did not know, and he probably did not know, of his plight until it was far advanced. I do not know how many of us have experienced the same sort of thing as it applies to a community or a vast area dying with drought. But, just as one of these incurable diseases may gradually and imperceptibly take the strength and finally the life of an individual, so prolonged drought can take the strength and finally the economic life of any community in the world. It has been so since the beginning. There are vast areas in various sections of the world where history tells us that at one time there flourished great civilizations with fields and vineyards and pastures where today there is nothing but drifting sands and stones.

For a long time we did not realize how that situation was brought about. Today with our better knowledge of soil conservation, we know that in many cases it has taken but a very small change in the balance of things to change the land from fertile pastures to arid deserts. We know that once a land starts on that downward road that unless man is intelligent enough to interpose some obstacles, that land is likely to continue to lose its productive powers until it becomes entirely unproductive. Drought begets drought, and erosion in-

creases erosion. I fear, my colleagues, that we are facing that situation in a vast area in America. It is especially severe in the area that I represent, but my home area is not the only area involved. My home State is not the only State involved. There are a number of States of this Union that are involved. Unfortunately there is a great area—far more States in 1956 than in 1955; more in 1955 than in 1954.

Do you realize that in some areas this thing has been going on for 9 long years? In my hometown, Waco, Tex., the rainfall records show that without exception for the last 9 years—for 9 consecutive years—we have had less than normal rainfall; and in this last year of 1956 we had only 45 percent of normal rainfall. And our normal is going down. I can remember when we had a normal rainfall of 35 inches at Waco. The Weather Bureau gave me these figures just this morning, which show that our normal rainfall is now only 32.90 inches, because 8 of these last 9 years are added into the years from which our average is figured, thereby bringing down our normal figure.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. A farmer told me in Utah that we had not had a normal year of precipitation in 40 years. I do not know what you call normal.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. IKARD. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Texas for bringing to the attention of the House this truly national problem. None of the great national disasters, in my judgment, are any more devastating than that of the drought. It may not strike with the suddenness of a storm or a flood or a tornado, but the end result is many more times disastrous. It is a creeping thing that slips up on you. Sometimes you realize that you are in the middle of a drought vacuum.

I think it might be of interest, since you say this is not confined to any one State but to a very great southwestern area and regions of the Midwest and Far West, to give you some figures I have.

In Texas our rainfall has been subnormal for 8 of the last 10 years. In 1956 it was a little over 5 inches below

normal. In 1951 it was 6.61 inches below normal. In 1952 it was 4.76 inches below normal. In 1953 it was 3.98 inches below normal. In 1954 it was 9½ inches below normal. And in 1955 it was 4.85 inches below normal. And in 1956 it was a little over 11½ inches below normal.

So it has been getting progressively worse, to the point where it is spelling out real disaster.

We are all interested in our own districts, of course, but if the gentleman would allow me I would like to put in some figures about the counties in my district.

In Wichita County the rainfall normally is 26.64 inches. It was 21.31 inches in 1956, which is a deficiency of 5.33 inches, or 20 percent.

Mr. POAGE. And I am sure that Wichita County probably has the best record of any county in the gentleman's district. I know that his home town happens to be in the best shape of any of the major towns in Texas as far as 1956 rainfall is concerned, although it is suffering very materially at the present time.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman. I was going to make that point. But even though we are off over 20 percent, we are in better shape than in much of the area around us. In other counties, Montague, was 49 percent below normal. In Cooke County, 41 percent. Wise County, 42 percent; Denton County, 51 percent; Hardeman County, 52 percent; Wilbarger County, 50 percent; Throckmorton, 58 percent; Young County, 50 percent; Archer, I do not have the figure. Baylor, 51 percent below normal. Jack County, 44 percent below; Foard County, 58 percent below, and Knox County, 62 percent below.

So you can see at the end of a 10-year period many counties in this area—and there are many other areas in Texas—who have been living with this thing much longer than I have, like the district represented by Mr. FISHER, that even now we are getting about 50 percent of our normal rainfall.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman very much for those illuminating figures. I hope to be able to give a few more general figures that will show something of the extent of this drought.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are the rainfall figures for a number of scattered Texas points for the past 10 years:

City	Normal annual rainfall (1921-50)	Actual annual rainfall									
		1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
Abilene.....	22.55	20.02	13.94	28.37	26.30	14.83	13.88	19.75	16.02	22.68	9.78
Fort Worth.....	32.29	30.20	20.11	43.65	34.22	23.37	22.69	24.74	19.55	25.16	18.55
Laredo.....	19.49	23.61	14.19	20.08	10.63	15.48	10.54	16.66	13.50	9.61	9.95
Lubbock.....	18.89	13.93	11.86	29.36	15.09	15.53	13.76	12.31	13.99	16.84	10.83
Lufkin.....	<sup>1</sup> 45.93	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	55.15	48.45	34.48	40.57	51.53	35.47	33.05	( <sup>3</sup> )
San Angelo.....	19.83	13.46	12.51	24.51	15.27	12.00	9.01	21.06	9.92	12.87	7.41
Waco.....	32.95	33.79	24.41	31.49	27.68	20.12	27.25	32.03	14.92	29.18	15.15
Wichita Falls.....	26.64	23.63	21.85	28.72	39.25	22.71	16.36	21.40	21.14	28.63	21.31

<sup>1</sup> Average 46 years.

<sup>2</sup> Incomplete.

<sup>3</sup> No data.



This shows, as I stated awhile ago, that Waco has had 9 consecutive years of less than normal rainfall and that last year we received only 45.97 percent of normal.

Here are the percentage figures for Texas cities:

## Texas

City	Percentage of normal rainfall during 1956	Number of years short out of last 10 years
	Percent	
Abilene.....	43.37	7
El Worth.....	57.44	8
Laredo.....	50.53	8
Lubbock.....	57.27	9
Laikin.....	<sup>1</sup> 71.95	<sup>2</sup> 4
San Angelo.....	37.36	8
Waco.....	45.97	9
Wichita Falls.....	79.99	7

<sup>1</sup> 1955.

<sup>2</sup> Out of last 5 for which records are available.

<sup>3</sup> Consecutive years.

I have found it impossible to get accurate rainfall figures for many out of Texas points. However, the Weather Bureau was able to give us figures on a few points with 1955 as the last year of record. These show that the drought is widespread.

Here is the record for a few points:

City	Normal annual rainfall (1921-50)	1955
Blanding, Utah.....	<sup>1</sup> 12.77	8.02
Clayton, N. Mex.....	15.42	12.82
La Junta, Colo.....	14.05	11.14
Woodward, Okla.....	<sup>2</sup> 25.07	17.07

<sup>1</sup> Average 47 years.

<sup>2</sup> Average 64 years.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is certainly rendering a fine service by bringing the attention of the Congress and the country to this disastrous situation which exists in Texas, the Southwest, and a good part of the Middle West, too, for that matter.

Probably the most understandable test of when a drought condition has reached disaster proportions is the designation by the Secretary of Agriculture of a county as being of disaster status. My able colleague from Texas [Mr. IKARD] has just given figures showing the widespread abnormal rainfall condition in his district. As the gentleman knows, every county in Texas except 6 out of 254 are now officially designated as disaster area counties, and many of those, certainly many in the area I represent in southwest Texas, have been so designated repeatedly, for as many as 5 or even 6 or 7 years. As the gentleman has so well pointed out, that carries with it a terrific toll in terms of economic loss to farmers, ranchmen, and to business as well. It has played havoc with topsoil in many places and much of the normal cover for grazing has been reduced or lost on the ranges.

I think for the purpose of underscoring the extent and the seriousness of this

disaster, if the gentleman will yield to me for just a minute—

Mr. POAGE. Certainly, I yield. I recognize the gentleman is deeply concerned over this situation and I value his suggestions.

Mr. FISHER. I will quote from some national publications that have taken notice of this condition. I assume, of course, that my distinguished colleague from Texas will follow later in his remarks with a discussion of legislation which he and a number of the rest of us have offered which we think would help alleviate or at least provide a means of helping restore the country to normalcy once the rain begins to fall. So, on the question of the seriousness and the extent of this disaster to which the gentleman has referred, I think it appropriate to quote from a few of these statements that have been made in recent months by nationally recognized publications. One that I have before me, Mr. Speaker, is from the U. S. News & World Report, dated October 12, 1956, and I will quote the first two paragraphs. Here is what it says:

The worst drought in living memory, far more widespread than the Dust Bowl drought of the 1930's, is searing the Great Plains and the vast cattle ranches of the Southwest. In the States that are hit hardest farmers have just gone through another year of burned-out crops. Many are going broke. Businessmen in the drought areas are hurt, some in small towns are folding up.

I call attention now to a quotation from the December 17, 1956, issue of Time magazine made after a thorough survey in respect to this matter, with a very good map from the Department of Agriculture showing the extent in color of this devastating drought. This statement is made after referring to the disastrous drought:

In 5 years the drought has stolen an estimated \$2.7 billion from the pockets of Texas farmers and ranchers alone. Over this entire area the total is many times higher. Too frequently those hit hardest have been those least able to resist.

Then I quote from a recent feature story in the Saturday Evening Post published within the past month, I believe; this statement is found at the beginning of the story:

To a great number of Texans 1957 will be a year of crisis. They need rain to survive. For 7 long years they have endured a drought that has scorched a vast area in southern Texas and dried up wells, springs, and rivers. Weather Bureau records going back to 1884 tell of nothing so disastrous as this. The siege in this area is judged to be the worst in at least 300 years.

One other quotation then I will conclude. I appreciate the patience of the gentleman in yielding to me.

In the current issue of Newsweek, dated January 14, 1957, is contained this paragraph which is pertinent to the subject:

During the past 5 years, drought has been creeping up on the American Southwest. Farmers complained about bad years, cattlemen moved their herds to new pictures, weather bureaus worriedly measured the rainfall. But only in recent months has the existence of drought, on a broad and destructive scale, become a grim reality. As

the new year began, the Department of Agriculture announced that about 700 counties in 15 States were classified as drought-disaster areas. A total of some 29 million acres, in the West and Southwest, are affected—or almost half a million square miles. Conditions in some areas, the Department said, are "the worst in recorded history." Losses have run to the billions.

I mention these, Mr. Speaker, because I think they serve to dramatize and to point out the extent of the seriousness of one of the most disastrous things that has overtaken the southwestern part of the United States in recorded history, as confirmed by the Weather Bureau and as confirmed by the Department of Agriculture itself.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] can confirm it from his own experience because he lives in that area.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, indeed; as the gentleman knows, I represent a vast stock-farming and ranching district which has been fighting this disaster for up to 7 years. I have seen it and lived with it, as the gentleman who is addressing us has done, during these long, depressing years.

I know it is most encouraging to the people in southwest Texas to know that President Eisenhower is taking time out from his very busy life to make a personal visit to the area on an inspection tour. He will spend a night in my hometown of San Angelo, and will see and fly over much of that parched area. That interest on the part of the President is most gratifying and appreciated.

The gentleman from Waco, now addressing us, has spearheaded many legislative drives for governmental aid, where it can be appropriately applied, to the victims and to the area. And he is doing that very thing now in the form of a proposed deferred-grazing plan for rangelands and a protein-feed program which is so badly needed during the coming months for breeding stock. These programs, along with stepped-up dam construction to retain floodwaters, will help to alleviate the suffering and contribute to rehabilitation and stability.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. May I say that we recognize Texans as authorities on drought because, from all reports, Texas has one of the worst droughts this year that has ever been experienced anywhere. But if I may, let me add a word on this subject as a Missourian.

We, too, have been wrestling with droughts for the last 5 years ourselves. I come from a section in south Missouri where 60 to 75 cents out of every dollar we handle originates with the meat, milk, and eggs produced on our Ozark farms. This year, in spite of the grasshoppers, we thought we had enough feed to get us through the winter. But in August and September we got barely enough rain to measure. We lost our fall pasture. And where we would ordinarily start feeding December 1, most of our farmers began using their winter supplies as early as the first day of August. This abnormally



long feeding season plus a subnormal crop to begin with have brought disaster to many counties of Missouri. Fifty to seventy-five percent of our farmers are out of hay and grain. Alfalfa hay is selling for \$52 a ton—prairie hay for \$35. Our people cannot buy it and stay in business. So the newspaper want ad sections are filled with notices of auction sales.

The drought hit us late this year, but the effect was just as disastrous as it has been in previous years when it hit us early.

The people of Missouri are grateful, indeed, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for bringing this drought situation to the Nation's attention. And may I add that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], in my opinion, has one of the finest grasps of the farm situation of any man I have met since I arrived in Washington. So I am eager to hear any suggestion he might have on this problem.

Let me point out that legislation is already on the books which would help the Missouri farmers who have been affected by the drought this year; but, as yet, we cannot get the Secretary of Agriculture to designate our section as a disaster area under Public Law 875 so we may receive its benefits. As far as the Secretary of Agriculture is concerned, we have no drought in southwest Missouri, in spite of the fact that the county agents say we have a drought, the State FFA Administrator says we have a drought, the State ASC administrator says we have a drought, and the two representatives who came from the Department of Agriculture to south Missouri and held hearings on the ground must have seen that we have a drought. But as yet, Governor Donnelly's two requests have fallen on deaf ears.

Now, I am in hopes that we can extend drought legislation to cover these serious problems that are affecting the farmers in so many States, and I am in hopes, too, that, in the administration of those proposals, they will not be lost by arbitrary administrative neglect.

I thank you very much.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from Missouri, and I can only suggest to him that certainly he has convinced me that they do have drought in southwestern Missouri. He has been most attentive to the problems of his district. I think he convinced the Committee on Agriculture, and the committee, through our chairman, did ask the Secretary of Agriculture who promised that he would make a resurvey of the Missouri situation immediately. I think that the gentleman is to be congratulated on his industry and his ability.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, for his initiative in bringing the serious problem of the drought areas to the attention of the Congress. I also appreciate his willingness to give me some of his time.

Mr. Speaker, we are a Christian nation, and consequently it is quite natural that when disaster strikes the hearts of all Americans go out in sympathetic aid to their stricken neighbors. Our response to flood, earthquake, and hurricane disasters and massacre, such as we have in Hungary, is usually dramatic and immediate.

Today you have given me the privilege of telling you briefly about a disaster that is not as sudden, not as dramatic, and not as appealing to the sympathies of the American people as the disasters of flood, earthquake, hurricane, or massacre; yet, at the same time, it is a slow-working disaster that bids well to become a disaster that is far more extensive and possibly just as brutal. It is the disaster of drought.

In the great State of Utah, it is not a sudden drought but, what is worse, a drought of 3 years' standing, growing in intensity and cumulative in its devastating effects.

The drought-stricken area in Utah covers 19 counties, largely in the south and southeastern portions in the State. All of these counties have been declared eligible for drought relief. This area depends upon the livestock industry almost entirely as its chief source of income. The situation has now become so critical that families who before the drought were well to do are now being forced to abandon their homes and ranches, to dispose of even their foundation herds of livestock, and to move or commute to industrial centers to find work.

Once the foundation herds are lost, the basis of the agricultural economy in the entire southern portion of the State is materially impaired and will require years to restore, if it is possible to completely restore it at all.

Both the drought and the overgrazing of the lands under the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have caused serious erosion in most of the Utah watersheds. As a result of poor cover, what snow there is melts and rushes down the slopes sweeping the topsoil with it instead of soaking into the ground and coming out later in the summer in the form of springs and streams as it used to do. So the drought is more than a threat to the livestock industry alone; it is a threat to industry and community life. Definite and unusual steps must be taken to correct the situation and to avert further disaster.

To illustrate the extent of damage, Mr. Royal K. Pierson, of the Bureau of Land Management, has estimated that throughout the southern third of the State of Utah the average reduction in cattle and sheep on Taylor grazing lands is 50 percent. This reduction was not forced by the Bureau of Land Management but was accepted voluntarily by the stockmen because they knew that there was insufficient feed to sustain their flocks.

Utah's livestock in the southern area are wintered largely on lands controlled by the Bureau of Land Management. In many large sections there is virtually no winter range. This confronts the livestock people with the alternative of

feeding their cattle on the ranches all winter at high cost or disposing of their livestock entirely. The drought has not only paralyzed the ranges but dried up the irrigation streams which were used to grow feed grains and hay.

The dilemma of having little range and very little, if any, feed, has caused the livestock people by the hundreds to dump their entire herds on the market; and, of course, this dumping of thin livestock has helped to depress the market.

Congress has passed laws which are giving considerable help, but livestock people are extremely reticent to accept the help; and when it is accepted, it is still difficult to even begin to make up for the extensive ravages of drought.

The Department of Agriculture is paying \$7.50 per ton toward the hay which livestock people in drought countries must purchase. The Department has also succeeded in securing reduced freight rates on this hay. But most of the worst sufferers are so remote from centers where hay is available that transportation costs are high. The scarcity of feed in the State has also greatly increased the cost of hay.

The Department also reimburses livestock people at the extent of \$1.50 per hundred weight on feed grains and protein concentrates. This is tending to help many of the livestock people to preserve their foundation herds.

Over the past 3½-year period, producers in Utah have received almost \$4,600,000, and over the past 6 months' period nearly \$1 million from the Government for drought relief loans and assistance. In addition to these measures, we have the Government purchase of grass fed livestock for the school-lunch program, the liberalization of credit, which is giving great assistance, also some easing of Forest Service restrictions on grazing. The latter will only postpone the day of reckoning, because when livestock are fed cottonseed cakes and protein concentrates and deprived of bulk feeds, they are so ravenous for the latter that they practically destroy the browse and forage that is left. This creates even a worse threat to the watersheds of the State.

I have gone on record with extensive statements to the effect that the support prices on the basic commodities have done much to injure the livestock industry, and that the livestock man is a "forgotten man." For example, today the price on wheat is 84 percent of parity; cotton is 87 percent of parity; rice is 82 percent of parity; peanuts 82 percent of parity; yet, poultry is 55 percent of parity; sheep 52 percent of parity; wool 74 percent of parity; beef 65 percent of parity; and calves 64 percent of parity. And now livestock has the drought situation to cope with as well as the competition of the basic commodities under price support. Surely it is time for us to take almost radical steps to overcome these disparities. Possible sources of help might be found in the following suggestions:

First, the Secretary of Agriculture has repeatedly asked for authority to use low-quality Government storage wheat as feed grain. I intend to submit a bill



which would give him the authority to dispose of 100 million bushels annually for this purpose; especially in consideration of the desperate situation of the livestock people in the drouth and deficient feed areas.

Second, exempt livestock and poultry people from marketing quota penalties on wheat if fed on their own farm.

Third, inasmuch as the acreage reserve portion and even the conservation portion of the soil-bank legislation were geared to benefit the basic commodities and give very little immediate assistance to the livestock industry, I implore Congress to give careful consideration to a program of deferred grazing on the watershed lands under the control of the Forest Service, some of the public domain controlled by the Bureau of Land Management, and some of the private range lands that are being seriously eroded and depleted. Furthermore, I am working upon legislation designed to accomplish this purpose. The situation of the Utah livestock people is a case in point and illustrates the needs for this latter suggestion:

Seventy-two percent of the entire area of the State of Utah is owned by the Federal Government. Fifty percent of the livestock is being forced off Taylor grazing lands this year. Twenty to thirty percent of the livestock is being forced off the national forests in some large areas.

Now if the drouth continues the forage on public domain will continue to decrease and the number of permits will continue to be reduced.

I recommend that the deferred grazing idea be applied to the public domain and some small payment be made to the permit holders to induce them to withdraw part of their livestock permanently or until such a time as their ranges could be restored by the Forest Service or the Soil Conservation Service. By this means many of these permit holders, livestock producers, could be saved from financial ruin, the marketing of livestock would be more orderly and profitable, and our precious watersheds be protected from further damage.

What other major industry in America has been so seriously hit, and what cause deserves more of our immediate attention?

The honorable chairman of our subcommittee on livestock on the House Agricultural Committee who has been speaking on this same subject announced yesterday that his subcommittee will start immediately to seek ways and means to help the livestock situation. I welcome these meetings.

(Mr. DIXON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Dixon] for his kind remarks. I hope it will be possible for him to work out such amendments or variation from what is being proposed today as will take care of the situation in his part of the country; because I confess very readily that the bill that I have introduced with many others today, was not drawn with his problems

primarily in mind because, after all, we all try to write bills to take care of the situation with which we are most familiar. I confess I am not familiar with the intermountain situation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a brief comment?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making an important speech, and at the moment I do not think I should take time to do more than express my greatest appreciation and admiration for the gentleman for dramatizing this desperate situation, and to try to encourage him to go ahead with his presentation. I should like to pledge my very best efforts in behalf of the program which we are sponsoring here today. I hope that his committee, the House Committee on Agriculture, can get going with the hearings and that we will be able to take quick and effective action.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and to point out that I am not presenting simply my own views, but those of a number of us who are involved in this, because there were actually some 17 Members from my own State who introduced a bill this morning. Those Members are WRIGHT PATMAN, GEORGE MAHON, O. C. FISHER, OLIN TEAGUE, OMAR BURLESON, CLARK W. THOMPSON, HOMER THORNBERRY, WALTER ROGERS, FRANK IKARD, JOHN DOWDY, MARTIN DIES, JACK BROOKS, JOE KILGORE, J. T. RUTHERFORD, JIM WRIGHT, and JOHN YOUNG, along with myself. If there were others of my own delegation, I would be delighted to have it called to my attention now. I know there have been several from other States who have today introduced this or a similar bill. I would not undertake to name all of them, because, frankly, I do not have all their names, but I do know that several others have introduced legislation.

The legislation that we have proposed is legislation falling into two parts—first, what I conceive to be immediate and palliative relief by providing for the inclusion of protein supplements or concentrates—cottonseed or soybean cake—along with and on the same terms as other feeds for which the Government provides assistance. At the present time the drought-relief program provides not only assistance in the purchase of cereal grains, of which the Government does hold a surplus which is used for this purpose, but also \$7.50 a ton in connection with hay that is purchased. I think those are worthy programs, and I certainly find no fault with them. However, there is a vast range area throughout the Southwest on which historically we have depended for protein supplements to carry us through the worst months of the winter. We believe that it is the most economical method of carrying livestock in that range area, where even during this terrible drought there is some browsing on live oak bushes and some mesquite leaves, which alone will not support anything, but which with protein supplements provide some filling and make it more economical than to

buy hay, particularly when you have to ship hay as we do now.

I would point out to my colleague from Utah that personally I have been buying hay from Idaho and shipping through his State to Texas. If you have any conception of the distance between central Texas and Idaho you know what the freight rate is, even with a considerable reduction which is being given by the railroads. But that is the cheapest hay we can get, and of course that is what we are buying.

We believe it would be a saving to the industry and a saving to the Government to assist in providing protein supplement on a program similar to that which is now used in connection with hay. So the last section of the bill which a number of us have introduced simply provides for the inclusion of protein supplements in the formula. The Department thinks they have the authority now, and they probably have, but they have felt some hesitancy about embarking on a program on which they had no specific instructions from the Congress. This bill would give them specific instructions in that respect, and I think would remove any reluctance there may now exist.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I would like to explain the other section of the bill but I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I am most reluctant to interrupt the gentleman's chain of thought and his dissertation to the House, but the questions I have are directed right to the remarks the gentleman is making at this time. I have two questions I should like to ask.

Mr. POAGE. Go ahead. I will do my best to answer.

Mr. AVERY. On this hay program, did the \$7.50 that was provided by the Department of Agriculture in Texas actually make cheaper feed for the cattlemen down there or did it just automatically raise the price of hay?

Mr. POAGE. A great many will tell you it automatically raised the price of hay. I do not think that was exactly the situation. The price of hay was going up. The program did not stop the price of hay from going up at all. The price of hay continued to go up. I understand that is true whether you are in a disaster area or not. The price of hay is going up all over the country steadily, week by week.

When our people found that it continued to go up, and it actually went up more than the \$7.50, many of them, I think without adequate thought about the matter, simply said, "Oh, the program caused the price of hay to go up." The program did not stop the increase in the price of hay but it at least helped to the extent of \$7.50 a ton.

Individually I was not eligible for that \$7.50 aid because I do not make the major portion of my income from agricultural pursuits, but those who were eligible certainly are in a better shape when they have to buy hay that costs them \$52 a ton laid down in Waco to get \$7.50 off it and make it \$44.50 than if they had to



pay the extra \$7.50. So I think the program has been of help.

Mr. AVERY. I am glad to hear the gentleman's comment on that subject. As I understand, all of Texas is in a drought area.

Mr. POAGE. All but about 12 counties, I believe.

Mr. AVERY. Where just a portion of a State is in a drought area, the people in that portion which is not in the drought area feel there is a gross discrimination against them because they also have to buy some hay and they feel the subsidy which is placed on it automatically makes it cost \$7.50 a ton more than it would have cost them.

Mr. POAGE. The only effect that I can see that it had on the price of hay is this: Obviously, when people could buy hay for \$7.50 a ton less than they otherwise could have bought it, more people would buy the hay. That is what the program was intended to do—make hay available to more producers. Therefore, it stimulated the demand for hay. To the extent that it stimulated the demand for hay, of course, it raised the price of hay all over the Nation, in and outside of the disaster area, but not to the full extent of the Government aid.

Mr. AVERY. If I may ask the gentleman one more question, and then I will not ask him to yield further. I believe I heard the gentleman say a while ago that this was the four or fifth consecutive year of drought in Texas?

Mr. POAGE. This is the ninth consecutive year in my hometown. This is the ninth consecutive year in which we have had less than the normal rainfall, and we only had 45 percent of the normal rainfall this year.

Mr. AVERY. Can the gentleman tell me what effect that has had on the calf crop of Texas?

Mr. POAGE. No; I cannot. It has had an adverse effect, but it has not had as much adverse effect as many of us expected it would have. I do not know how long it takes to show up, but we do know that inevitably it shows up. But, we have not had as much reduction in the calf crop as we had feared that we would although there is in 1956 a definite reduction.

Mr. AVERY. That is, there has been a reduction in the herd.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to explain the other phases of this bill which I conceive to be even more important than the protein food provision. I do not want to minimize the importance of giving some immediate relief because remember this is January, and in January, February and March we are likely to have our most critical time so far as livestock is concerned. Even if it does not rain, it is better to have warm weather than it is to have freezing weather. A dry, cold norther can hurt you worse than dry, warm winds, at least as far as the livestock industry is concerned. So, regardless of what happens in the way of rain, we have to have help now because in a few months there is not going to be anything left to help in the way of livestock.

Of course, the land will still be there. Now I want to talk about the land and what we can, and what I think we must do to preserve our soil, if we are going to maintain a great grazing industry in America rather than become simply an area of nomadic tribes shifting from one place to the other even as the sands of the earth shift. Today, great portions of the southwestern United States are almost denuded of all grass, particularly out in the short-grass country, which is entirely a bunch-grass country. Some of the people in the eastern part of the United States do not understand what we mean by that. This country never has the kind of turf that you get in Bermuda grass or carpet grass. But in the best years, our mesquite and our buffalo and our grama grasses and other bunch grasses produce bunches so large and so numerous that they appear to cover the whole surface. Most of that grass is now dead. It does not renew by vines and runners—at least most of it does not renew by running—such as Bermuda grass does—it renews from seed. It will make seed rather rapidly if it gets rain and gets proper temperatures. Some of the grama grasses of New Mexico may get up and seed in 1 month's time and that seed will, given a good season and given good treatment, restore that land to its productivity. But, if as each bunch of grass grows up there are two cows standing there to grab that blade of grass as it appears out of the ground, that grass will never seed and next year instead of having more grass, you will have less and on and on ad infinitum until the time when you have absolutely none.

There are areas out there that look as if it had absolutely none, but we are hopeful that there may be some seed still in the ground. But it will not be any good if there are animals there to grab that sprout before it has time to get up. Yet what is the situation with the landowner?

Let us assume that a landowner has three sections of land out in that grass country. He has not any grass on his land today, but if he is like most of his neighbors he owes debts. He will owe money on his land, owe money to his bank, and he will probably owe for his grocery bill. Let us assume that it begins before the rain. Then what happens? Too many of our colleagues are prone to say, "Oh, but it rained, and therefore the drought is over." My friends, rain today will not cure our situation. If it rains 2 inches every 2 days for the next 2 months, we are still in bad shape. It is going to require several years. If we allow this to go on, that man who owns three sections of land will find irresistible pressure applied to stock that land, because that is the only way in the world he can make anything from it. You do not make a living off of the land simply by riding over it and taking pictures. You have to put livestock on it to make something off of the land. His creditors will demand that he put something on it.

If we allow this to occur we reverse the process that we wanted to put into effect to rehabilitate that grass, so we ask, "How can we minimize the time needed

to restore the turf?" That is what this bill tries to do. It occurred to a number of us who introduced identical bills today that the Department, under the terms of Public Law 875, which is the disaster bill, should provide a program that would pay that man the normal rental of that land for not to exceed 3 years. The exact time is up to the Secretary of Agriculture. If he finds 1 year will restore the land, he does not have to make it longer. But he can continue it for 3 years after the termination of the drought. He starts it immediately and continues it until such time as the drought is broken, and for 3 years thereafter, if necessary.

Some of you will say, "Why did you not put that program in the soil bank bill?" Some will say, "That is the Albert amendment." So it is. At least it has many similarities to that amendment, but there was serious argument about placing the Albert amendment in the soil bank bill. There is an honest difference of opinion as to whether we should place it in the soil bank bill or not. Just this week the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before our committee and told us he did not think it would be well to place that in the soil bank bill. It seems to me that if we want results, the only logical thing to do is to try to compromise our differences and try to get together on ground where we can all agree. I hope we can all agree. I hope the Secretary of Agriculture and the President will agree. I sincerely say that I have reason to believe that they will agree with this program if we can provide this program of soil conservation separate from the soil bank program.

So we have completely segregated it from the soil bank, and we do not amend the soil bank bill at all. The bill that we amend is the disaster bill. This program that we bring you this afternoon is merely an addition to the disaster program, and is not an amendment to the soil bank bill in any respect. Whether that is the proper approach or not, I would not argue with anyone, yet I tell you the Department of Agriculture expressed itself as believing that if we are given relief it should be separate from the soil bank bill. So we have separated it.

We believe we have brought a bill that cannot be properly criticized by anyone, no matter what his viewpoint on the Albert amendment may be. Yet at the same time we believe that this bill will give not only immediate assistance to those who have stock that need protein to keep alive during the remainder of the winter, but that will also bring a large measure of protection to the denuded grasslands of a vast area of America. This is far more than merely a bill to give some temporary assistance to the people whose herds are immediately in trouble.

It is a bill that at least gives us an opportunity to reverse the unhappy forces of nature and to tend to restore the fertility of a once very productive area. So some 17 Members from my own State have all joined in presenting this legislation. We hope that the membership of the House from all States will



feel that it is worthy, that it is entitled to your consideration, not simply because it may give some relief to some hard-pressed cowmen in Texas, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Kansas, but also because it will tend to maintain the productivity of a large area of the United States which this country simply cannot afford to lose.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague not only for his remarkably coherent statement of the problems of the drought-stricken area which many of us represent, but also for the effort and tedious application on his part which largely produced these measures that have been introduced today.

I think it is a realistic approach to a very real problem. The farmers and stockmen in our drought-smitten areas in Texas and elsewhere throughout the country have gone through very rugged experiences. They have practically exhausted not only their resources, but in many cases their credit as well.

There is one additional feature of the legislation which I think should be stressed and that is the protection they are afforded in the bills presented giving them long-range benefits that will flow from the long-range grazing features. I call attention to it:

No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred grazing is for the period of less than 12 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in over-grazing non-deferred areas.

A second feature which I should like to emphasize is that for the first time machinery is provided for the Department of Agriculture to furnish some needed help to dirt farmers who are as badly hurt by the drought as are the stockmen, in that it authorizes the Secretary to furnish feed for livestock or seeds for planting in this area.

I am pleased to join with the gentleman in introducing this legislation and I do now join with him in urging its early adoption.

Mr. POAGE. I am very pleased to have the help of my distinguished colleague.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for bringing up at this early period of the session this very perplexing problem. Further, I should like to congratulate him for his decision to hold hearings before the Livestock Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of which he is chairman.

Different parts of our State has at different times been affected by this drought condition. I know the conditions have been much more severe over a much larger area in the Southwest. But I think all the Members from the drought area concede that we must be ever mindful

of the effect of some of these programs on prices in the livestock industry. I have thought about this problem. I think the principal problem is one of too many cattle. And I think this drought aid has contributed to this increase in numbers. The livestock people are hurting, both in and out of the drought areas.

It seems to me that the first part of the bill referring to deferred grazing, as I have heard it explained here has a great deal to commend it. I voted for and supported the Albert amendment. On the other hand, it seems to me that perhaps the second part pertaining to further Government assistance in purchasing protein feeds tends to undo some of the things in the first part in that it tends to keep numbers up and thereby keep prices down. In my State, and I think the same thing is true in other parts of the drought area, through the drought programs and some other programs, I think we have maybe done something to the livestock producer instead of doing something for the livestock producer, because we are encouraging him to put money that he does not have into producing a cow that probably should not be there. Therefore, he gets in debt to the bank to the tune of about \$20 per year even with the aid we give him. After 3 years of buying feed even with the aid, the banker owns the cow, he has the debt. Better off he would have been if he had sold her and spent the winter down around Brownsville or down in Florida for those 3 years.

I thought I was really asking for trouble when I took the floor and addressed the executive committee of the Wyoming Cattlemen's Association on December 7 last, and told them exactly that and a few other things. I was surprised to find that they agreed with me. The head of the drought committee said: "We are going into this year with more cattle in Wyoming with the drought than we had last year."

I want to commend the gentleman for going into this problem. I just throw out the idea, however, that we should proceed with the thought of doing something that is really helpful. I know the gentleman is sincere in that desire, as are all of the gentlemen who have introduced this bill for an industry whose problems demand attention and have not been getting it. I will follow the committee hearings carefully, will expect to appear before the committee and assure my colleagues of my eagerness to work with you in developing and implementing any sound action that will tend to solve the problems of the livestock industry both within and without the drought area.

Mr. POAGE. I could not agree with anyone more than I agree with the gentleman when he points out that many of us would be better off if we had sold out in 1950 and got out of the cow business when it was good. Our hindsight is so much better than our foresight. We have officially applied exactly the same kind of formula that as individuals we apply. I guess that we will have to live under that kind of situation. We cannot tell. If the situation gets worse next year, it is a mistake to have any

kind of assistance program, if we know the situation was going to get worse in the coming years. But, if perchance, as every farmer and every livestock man always hopes and believes, next year is going to be that good year we have been looking for, then, of course, it would be a cruel and a tragic thing to say to the people who have suffered 9 years of drought: "You are out," but to the fellow who has been fortunate and has not had a drought, "You are in for the kill."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this bill before the House. I joined him as co-sponsor of the legislation. I can appreciate that there may be some objection to this program being in the soil bank. Personally, I think it would have been better in the soil bank than as a part of the drought-relief program because I do not think the whole problem of deferred grazing or deferred planning should be a part of the relief program. It should be a part of the surplus-reduction program which the Soil Bank Act contemplates. I can appreciate the fact there is a practical objection to the approach which I suggested. If we can get this program moving under the present bill, I certainly will support my colleague in every particular. I congratulate him for bringing the matter to the attention of the House and I do hope we will not limit it when it is all over just to the drought stricken areas of the country. I think it should be of general application.

Mr. POAGE. I cannot say I would feel that we ought to make the full rental payment applicable to the Nation over. I think we should have a general deferred grazing program the Nation over, for which we do have authority now. But the payments are so low it cannot keep a man in business. Only when he is making money can he afford to participate in the general program. I doubt that we should apply rates as high as we have suggested on a nationwide basis.

Mr. ALBERT. That may be true, and I respect the gentleman's judgment on that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks, and that all Members who have spoken on the subject I have been discussing may have the right to revise their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the work he has done on the drought situation in Texas. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to place in the Record at this point an exchange of correspondence concerning the use of protein concentrates.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

DECEMBER 18, 1956.

HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON,

*Secretary of Agriculture,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The drought condition in most of Texas continues. My own district, the Sixth Congressional District, is in a critical condition. It has been necessary for many farmers and ranchers to reduce their breeding herds; and most of these ranchers and farmers, who are continuing to hold their breeding herds together, are doing so under the most adverse weather and price conditions and are utilizing the emergency feed grain program.

I am very pleased to see that the President will tour the drought area personally, and I am confident that the administration will find it necessary to recommend a continuation of the emergency programs. I believe that the emergency feed grain program can be made to function more effectively if it can be altered to include protein supplements, such as cottonseed and soybean meal. I am of the opinion that authority exists for administrative action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to include these products.

Reference is made to section 301, Public Law 480, 83d Congress. This section contains the following pertinent statement concerning the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture in making agricultural commodities available for distress areas:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Corporation, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem in the public interest, shall make available any farm commodity or product thereof owned or controlled by it for use in relief disaster."

Since cotton is a farm commodity controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and cottonseed meal is a product thereof, I believe that the Secretary would be acting within the authority granted him by section 301, if he included cottonseed meal as one of the feeds available for farmers under the emergency feed program.

Farmers and ranchers in my area have complained that the grains now included in the emergency-feed program, namely, corn, oats, barley, and grain sorghum, are inadequate in themselves for efficient and economical maintenance of cattle; and that the efficiency of these grains can be greatly increased by the addition of a small amount of protein supplement, such as cottonseed or soybean meal. Many farmers in the drought area have available supplies of low-quality roughage, such as corn cobs, baled corn shucks, cotton burrs, and feed by-products. There is also available on some pastures and ranches low-quality dry grass, weeds, stubble, and other roughages. In some areas prickly pear can be utilized by burning. Cattle can be wintered successfully on these types of feeds, if a limited amount of protein supplement is available.

It has been suggested that the farmers receiving emergency-feed certificates should be permitted to exercise some latitude in the choice of feeds which he buys; and that he should be permitted to use part of his emergency-feed certificates for the purchase of protein supplements to be used, either with the grain he obtains through the use of emergency-feed certificates or in connection with other feeds and roughage available to him.

In view of the emergency of the situation, it will be appreciated if this matter can receive immediate attention, and appropriate changes to the existing program made.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
*Congressman.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, January 8, 1957.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: Your letter of January 2 and the accompanying letter signed by Mr. Frazee concerning cottonseed meal has been referred to me for reply.

Mr. Frazee was correct when he stated that legal authority does exist within the Department to include cottonseed meal, soybean and linseed meal in our drought-assistance program. However, the Department has decided not to include these items as a matter of policy. These concentrates are at this time available at a relatively low price in Texas, while hay is expensive. It seemed best to use our limited funds to assist drought-stricken farmers in the purchase of hay. None of these high-protein concentrates are held in surplus by the Department. Inclusion of them in our assistance program would unquestionably limit the use of surplus grains. We, of course, could not include cottonseed meal without also including soybean and linseed meal, none of which are presently surplus in Department supplies. We realize that many stockmen in the Southwest would like to have these high concentrates included in our program, but the Department officials feel that we can best serve drought-stricken farmers with our limited funds by assisting them with roughage, permitting them to use their own funds in the purchase of concentrates.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. DEWART,  
*Assistant to the Secretary.*

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the opportunity which our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has given us in this review of this very serious situation. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I want to assure these interested colleagues of mine, although I come from an area which seldom experiences a drought, that I am very sympathetic to this problem and will give it my closest attention.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate that very much.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important and helpful that the gentleman from Texas has brought this extremely serious situation to our attention. While I, like the gentleman from Maine, have not experienced anything of this kind in my area, I have heard of the great suffering which has resulted from the drought conditions in the West and Southwest particularly. I feel, certainly, that the President and the administration are acutely conscious of this situation and will welcome the aid of the gentleman from Texas who is so well qualified in this field. It seems to me that the evidence of interest of the administration is dramatically shown by the fact that the President is planning on next Monday to make a tour of the affected areas including, I believe, the State of Texas.

Mr. POAGE. He is to be in San Angelo on Monday.

Mr. KEATING. He will make brief stops to talk to the people and see with his own eyes this very serious situation. I hope that that action, together with the fine work which the gentleman from Texas and his committee will do, will help alleviate this very serious situation.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express to the gentleman my deep and sincere appreciation for the fine leadership shown relative to this most important matter. All of the State of Oklahoma is affected, and particularly my great district, the sixth district, which is the western district in our great State. And, I want to say to you that I recognize the gentleman as one of the real authorities in this House on this subject matter. There are others that are far better authority than I. I want to offer you my cooperation in every way as a Member of this body in furtherance of this most vital and important subject matter.

Mr. POAGE. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for the very lucid explanation he has given this body on the legislation many of us introduced today, and to further express my appreciation for his having taken this time to acquaint the many Members of this House with this condition which exists all over our country. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] came down into my district during this last fall and saw at first hand some of the conditions existing in the very southern part of the State, a situation which not only has affected the rangeland, a situation which has affected the underground water, with a consequent drop of water table, a situation which has affected irrigation from the Falcon reservoir, which has brought irrigation to a halt for some 6 or 7 months. The people in my section of the country are very appreciative of the interest you have taken and that this body has taken in proposing future legislation, and I hope that this legislation will result in restoring their pastureland and conserving their rainfall.

Mr. POAGE. Nobody, save the people in my section and your section, appreciates the real situation that exists, but I believe the legislation will be helpful.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that the American people are deeply indebted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] for the great interest he has shown in the agricultural problems throughout the years. Since I have been in Congress I have noticed that he has always been a leader in these programs to help work out these problems, and no one knows better the situation faced by the people of our section than the ranking member on the Agriculture Committee. I think that the Members of the Congress who are not familiar with the particular drought situation to which this legislation is directed would do themselves a great thing if they would go into this matter and study it and realize that all of the stories that have come out of the Southwest to the effect that these programs are many



times designed to help the big raisers are not true. It is the little people in the cattle business that are being hurt when something is not done to bring them relief. There is one thing that this bill brings them that is most important, and the gentleman has given an excellent explanation of it, and that is this, that it is the land itself that belong to every American in this country upon which our future must depend that is at stake. And if we do not do something about it now, we should be called upon if we are alive to answer to the future generations that will suffer by our failure to act at this time.

Mr. POAGE. I especially appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Texas because his district is one of the few that is entirely within that area covered by the Great Plains program which helps to do exactly what we are proposing here. But that Great Plains program is not applicable to a vast part of the area involved. If everybody were as fortunately situated as the gentleman from the Panhandle, we might not need this legislation, but he has not taken a narrow view of it and has supported the legislation for all the rest of us as well as for his own people.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this problem to us. I have appreciated very much this very informative discussion. I might just sit here and be a recipient of the good that this bill will do and not even let those who have proposed it know that I am interested in it. However, I do want to say that I am behind the gentleman in every way, that I am in a part of this drought area and understand the problem; and I know that something must be done about it.

Mr. POAGE. I deeply appreciate that. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a copy of the bill and certain tables that I have not had time to refer to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. The bill which I introduced this afternoon, and which is identical with bills introduced by many other Members of this House and by the senior Senator from Texas, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, in the other House, is as follows:

A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas, under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county affected by such disaster in which such grazing is determined to be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such program shall be applicable only to land which is normally

used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the land. Such program in any county shall be made available to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain available for a period of not less than 3 years after the termination of such county as a major disaster area.

SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors. No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred grazing is for a period of less than 12 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program concurrently.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress (act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State extension service which, with other feed available will provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in performing such functions."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about the fact that the history of drought relief thus far can be summed up in the phrase, "too little and too late."

Hundreds of thousands of farmers and stockmen have already gone to the wall in this great national disaster, and many more thousands stand today at the brink of financial ruin.

It is a privilege to join my colleagues from Texas in this effort to save our

cattlemen, and to save millions of acres of grazing land from disastrous overgrazing. Already, in Oklahoma, terrible damage has been done to our fine cattle country by overgrazing practices brought on by the combination of drought and economic adversity.

I have introduced an identical bill and earnestly hope this needed legislation will receive early committee and House consideration.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COOPER for 1 hour on Monday next.

Mr. FEIGHAN for 1 hour on February 14.

Mr. KEATING, on Monday next, for 15 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY, on Tuesday next, for 30 minutes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. McCORMACK and to include a speech he made in Boston.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHUDOFF (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. WIER.

Mr. MARSHALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FISHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. FLOOD and to include an editorial.

Mr. WILLIS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN in two instances and to include an editorial and a speech.

Mr. ABERNETHY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include a letter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.



Mr. HAYS of Ohio (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) in one instance and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. Pelly) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOOLEY and to include a speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN and to include a letter.

Mr. BERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. BERRY) in four instances.

Mr. BEAMER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NIMTZ and to include an editorial from the Culver Citizen.

Mr. DENNISON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN and to include a speech made at Spokane on November 13.

Mr. MACK of Washington in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABEITT (at the request of Mr. McCormack) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. McCormack) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota) and to include a letter.

Mr. HULL and to include an address by Hon. Harry S. Truman, former President of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) the remarks he made today.

Mr. ALBERT the remarks he made previously today.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas) at the conclusion of the day's proceedings.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas) and to include extraneous matter.

#### SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution making Inauguration Day a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 14, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

254. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preven-

tive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 29th annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended on June 30, 1956, and the report of audit covering the same period, made by the United States General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

255. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

256. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to validate certain payments in settlement of unused accrued leave heretofore or hereafter made to certain members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

257. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

258. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal certain provisions of title 10, United States Code, relating to professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

260. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John, and Little Streets adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

259. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the transfer of commissioned officers between the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

261. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, P. R., between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

262. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John, and Little Streets adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

263. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide authority for the reassignment of officers of the naval service restricted in the performance of duty to an unrestricted status, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

264. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply

facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area,' approved October 11, 1951"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

265. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

266. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a report by rank and age groups, the number of officers above the rank of major in the Army and lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

263. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize repayment to the Treasury of amounts paid to the Federal Reserve banks for making industrial loans"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

269. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, Air Force, and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with small and large concerns for work in the United States, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

270. A letter from Georgetown Barge Dock Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge Dock Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1956, pursuant to the act approved September 26, 1888; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

271. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1956; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

272. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the United States General Accounting Office during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 312 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

273. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone, President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ending December 31, 1956, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 398); to the Committee on Government Operations.

274. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of this Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, with regard to the disposal of foreign excess property, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

275. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relief of certain female members of

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2357

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. ALBERT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in con-  
4       nection with any major disaster due to drought determined  
5       by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Gov-  
6       ernment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of  
8       the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such  
4 program shall be applicable only to land which is normally  
5 used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined  
6 that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of  
7 the land. Such program in any county shall be made avail-  
8 able to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain  
9 available for a period of not less than three years after the  
10 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program  
19 if the deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve  
20 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of  
21 livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm  
22 or ranch results in overgrazing non-deferred areas. Payment  
23 to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county  
24 shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the  
25 disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of rough-

1 age, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination  
2 thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State exten-  
3 sion service which, with other feed available, will provide the  
4 minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock.  
5 The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property,  
6 and funds of any agency of the United States Department of  
7 Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for  
8 carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies  
9 so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which  
10 are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs  
11 and administrative expenses necessary in performing such  
12 functions.”





86TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2357

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ALBERT

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2358

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. BROOKS of Texas introduced the following bill; which was referred to the  
Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of

1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally  
5 used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined  
6 that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of  
7 the land. Such program in any county shall be made avail-  
8 able to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain  
9 available for a period of not less than three years after the  
10 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
14 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
15 program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration  
16 the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carry-  
17 ing out the program, and any other relevant factors. No  
18 payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
20 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred  
21 areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in over-  
22 grazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for de-  
23 ferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed  
24 \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9       SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14       SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17       “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Sec-  
24 retary may determine to be required by the nature and effect  
25 of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types



1 of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any  
2 combination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
6 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall re-  
9 imburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any com-  
10 modities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
11 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
12 sary in performing such functions."





---

---

# A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

---

By Mr. Brooks of Texas

---

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2359

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. BURLESON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of  
8       the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of

1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be  
3 a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain  
9 available for a period of not less than three years after the  
10 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consid-  
16 eration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available  
17 for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
20 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred  
21 areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in over-  
22 grazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for  
23 deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed  
24 \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such



1 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
2 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress,  
12 such funds as are necessary to carry out the program author-  
13 ized herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any  
18 major disaster determined by the President to warrant as-  
19 sistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875,  
20 Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to  
21 furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
25 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of

1 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combi-  
2 nation thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State  
3 extension service which, with other feed available, will pro-  
4 vide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of live-  
5 stock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities,  
6 property, and funds of any agency of the United States De-  
7 partment of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Cor-  
8 poration, for carrying out these functions and shall reimburse  
9 the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodities fur-  
10 nished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen,  
11 and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in per-  
12 forming such functions."





## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BURLISON

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2360

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. DEMPSEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
10 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consid-  
16 eration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available  
17 for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the  
19 deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecu-  
20 tive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock  
21 from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch  
22 results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any  
23 person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall  
24 not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration.  
4 The program authorized herein for any county shall be in  
5 addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect  
25 of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types

1 of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facil-  
6 ities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
9 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodi-  
10 ties furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
11 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
12 sary in performing such functions."





---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. DEMPSEY

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2361

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. DIES introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in con-  
4       nection with any major disaster due to drought determined  
5       by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Gov-  
6       ernment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county affect-  
2 ed by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be a  
3 substantial factor in agricultural production. Such programs  
4 shall be applicable only to land which is normally used for  
5 grazing and with respect to which it is determined that de-  
6 ferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the land.  
7 Such program in any county shall be made available to  
8 farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain available  
9 for a period of not less than three years after the termination  
10 of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
14 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
15 program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration  
16 the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for  
17 carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
20 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred  
21 areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in overgraz-  
22 ing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred  
23 grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed \$5,000  
24 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such

1 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
2 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its  
3 purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The pro-  
4 gram authorized herein for any county shall be in addition  
5 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county  
6 authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall  
7 be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this and  
8 any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any  
18 major disaster determined by the President to warrant as-  
19 sistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875,  
20 Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to  
21 furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed for  
22 livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods of  
23 time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
25 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of

1 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
6 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
9 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any com-  
10 modities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
11 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
12 sary in performing such functions.”





---

---

A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

---

By Mr. Dies

---

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2362

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. Dowdy introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in con-  
4       nection with any major disaster due to drought determined  
5       by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Gov-  
6       ernment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such  
4 program shall be applicable only to land which is normally  
5 used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined  
6 that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of  
7 the land. Such program in any county shall be made avail-  
8 able to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain  
9 available for a period of not less than three years after the  
10 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
14 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
15 program to accomplish its objective, taking into considera-  
16 tion the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available  
17 for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
20 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the de-  
21 ferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in  
22 overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for  
23 deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed  
24 \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such

1 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
2 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its  
3 purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The pro-  
4 gram authorized herein for any county shall be in addition  
5 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county  
6 authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall  
7 be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this  
8 and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the  
25 disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of rough-

1 age, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination  
2 thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State exten-  
3 sion service which, with other feed available will provide the  
4 minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock.  
5 The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property,  
6 and funds of any agency of the United States Department of  
7 Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for  
8 carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies  
9 so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which  
10 are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs  
11 and administrative expenses necessary in performing such  
12 functions.”





---

## A BILL

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. Dowdy

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2363

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. FISHER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in con-  
4       nection with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of  
8       the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county af-  
2 fected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be  
3 a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the  
10 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consider-  
16 ation the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for  
17 carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
20 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred  
21 areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in over-  
22 grazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for de-  
23 ferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed  
24 \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated  
11 for the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress,  
12 such funds as are necessary to carry out the program au-  
13 thorized herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the  
25 disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of rough-

1 age, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination  
2 thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State exten-  
3 sion service which, with other feed available will provide the  
4 minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock.  
5 The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property,  
6 and funds of any agency of the United States Department of  
7 Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for  
8 carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies  
9 so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which  
10 are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs  
11 and administrative expenses necessary in performing such  
12 functions.”





---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. FISHER

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2364

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. IKARD introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of  
8       the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
10 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program if  
19 the deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve con-  
20 secutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock  
21 from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch  
22 results in overgrazing non-deferred areas. Payment to any  
23 person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall  
24 not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such

1 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
2 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition  
5 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county  
6 authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall  
7 be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this and  
8 any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under public Law  
20 875, Eight-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen  
22 feed for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or  
23 periods of time and under such terms and conditions as the  
24 Secretary may determine to be required by the nature and  
25 effect of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the

1 types of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any  
2 combination thereof, and in the amount recommended by  
3 the State extension service which, with other feed available  
4 will provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic  
5 herd of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel,  
6 facilities, property, and funds of any agency of the United  
7 States Department of Agriculture, including Commodity  
8 Credit Corporation, for carrying out these functions and  
9 shall reimburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any  
10 commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers  
11 or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses  
12 necessary in performing such functions.”





---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. IKARD

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2365

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. KILGORE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined  
5       by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Gov-  
6       ernment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
10 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
14 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
15 program to accomplish its objective, taking into considera-  
16 tion the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for  
17 carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
20 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the de-  
21 ferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in over-  
22 grazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for  
23 deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed  
24 \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such

1 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
2 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its  
3 purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The pro-  
4 gram authorized herein for any county shall be in addition  
5 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county  
6 authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall  
7 be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this and  
8 any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the  
25 disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of rough-

1 age, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination  
2 thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State  
3 extension service which, with other feed available will pro-  
4 vide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of  
5 livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
6 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
9 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodi-  
10 ties furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranch-  
11 men, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in  
12 performing such functions.”





---

## A BILL

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. KUGORE

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2366

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. MAHON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3      That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4      tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5      the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6      ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7      amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8      of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9      and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county af-  
2 fected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such  
4 program shall be applicable only to land which is normally  
5 used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined  
6 that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection  
7 of the land. Such program in any county shall be made  
8 available to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall  
9 remain available for a period of not less than three years  
10 after the termination of such county as a major disaster  
11 area.

12 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
13 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
14 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
15 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
16 program to accomplish its objective, taking into considera-  
17 tion the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for  
18 carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.

19 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
20 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
21 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred  
22 areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in over-  
23 grazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for de-  
24 ferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed  
25 \$5,000 for any one year.

1        SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include  
2 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
3 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
4 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
5 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
6 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
7 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
8 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
9 this and any other program concurrently.

10       SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in  
11 addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the  
12 purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
13 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
14 herein.

15       SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
16 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
17 follows:

18       “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
19 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
20 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
21 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 185), as amended,  
22 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
23 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
24 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
25 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of

1 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of  
2 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
3 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
4 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
5 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
6 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facil-  
7 ities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
8 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
9 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall re-  
10 imburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any com-  
11 modities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
12 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
13 sary in performing such functions."





---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. MAHON

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2368

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. ROGERS of Texas introduced the following bill; which was referred to the  
Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in con-  
4       nection with any major disaster due to drought determined  
5       by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Gov-  
6       ernment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of  
8       the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally  
5 used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined  
6 that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of  
7 the land. Such program in any county shall be made avail-  
8 able to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain  
9 available for a period of not less than three years after the  
10 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consid-  
16 eration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available  
17 for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive  
20 months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from  
21 the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results  
22 in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person  
23 for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not  
24 exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the  
25 disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of

1 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available, will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facil-  
6 ities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
9 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commod-  
10 ities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
11 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
12 sary in performing such functions.”





85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2368

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2369

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. RUTHERFORD introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4        tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5        the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6        ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7        amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8        of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9        and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of

1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county af-  
2 fected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be  
3 a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
10 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program if the  
19 deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecu-  
20 tive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock  
21 from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch  
22 results in overgrazing non-deferred areas. Payment to any  
23 person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall  
24 not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purpose and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9     SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14     SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as follows:

16     “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any  
17 major disaster determined by the President to warrant assist-  
18 ance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875,  
19 Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to  
20 furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed for  
21 livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods of time  
22 and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may  
23 determine to be required by the nature and effect of the disaster.  
24 Feed for livestock shall include the types of roughage, grain, or  
25 protein feed concentrates, or any combination thereof, and in



1 the amount recommended by the State extension service which,  
2 with other feed available will provide the minimum subsistence  
3 ration for the basic herd of livestock. The Secretary may  
4 utilize the personnel, facilities, property, and funds of any  
5 agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, in-  
6 cluding Commodity Credit Corporation, for carrying out these  
7 functions and shall reimburse the agencies so utilized for the  
8 value of any commodities furnished which are not paid for by  
9 the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative  
10 expenses necessary in performing such functions.”



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined  
3 to be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such  
4 program shall be applicable only to land which is normally  
5 used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined  
6 that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of  
7 the land. Such program in any county shall be made avail-  
8 able to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain  
9 available for a period of not less than three years after the  
10 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program if  
19 the deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve con-  
20 secutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock  
21 from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch  
22 results in overgrazing non-deferred areas. Payment to any  
23 person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall  
24 not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 "SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 "(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secre-  
24 tary may determine to be required by the nature and effect  
25 of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types



1 of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any  
2 combination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
6 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
9 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodi-  
10 ties furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranch-  
11 men, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary  
12 in performing such functions.”



---

# A BILL

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 876, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. THORNBERRY

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2371

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. WRIGHT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in con-  
4       nection with any major disaster due to drought determined  
5       by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Gov-  
6       ernment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county af-  
2 fected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be  
3 a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
10 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
14 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
15 program to accomplish its objective, taking into considera-  
16 tion the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for  
17 carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
20 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the de-  
21 ferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in over-  
22 grazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for  
23 deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed  
24 \$5,000 for any one year.

1        SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include  
2 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
3 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
4 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
5 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
6 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
7 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
8 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
9 this and any other program concurrently.

10       SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
11 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
12 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
13 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
14 herein.

15       SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
16 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as  
17 follows:

18       “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
19 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
20 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
21 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
22 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
23 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
24 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secre-

1 tary may determine to be required by the nature and effect  
2 of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of  
3 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combi-  
4 nation thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State  
5 extension service which, with other feed available, will pro-  
6 vide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of  
7 livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
8 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
9 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
10 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
11 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodi-  
12 ties furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranch-  
13 men, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in  
14 performing such functions.”





---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. WRIGHT

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2372

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. YOUNG introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of  
10      Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county af-  
11      fected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to

1 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
2 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
3 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
4 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
5 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
6 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
7 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
8 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

9 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
10 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
11 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
12 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
13 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consider-  
14 ation the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available  
15 for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
16 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
17 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
18 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred  
19 areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in overgraz-  
20 ing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred  
21 grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed \$5,000  
22 for any one year.

23 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include  
24 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
25 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate

1 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
2 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition  
3 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county  
4 authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall  
5 be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this  
6 and any other program concurrently.

7 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
8 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
9 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
10 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
11 herein.

12 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
13 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
14 follows:

15 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any  
16 major disaster determined by the President to warrant assist-  
17 ance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875,  
18 Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to  
19 furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed for  
20 livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods of  
21 time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
22 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the  
23 disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of rough-  
24 age, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination  
25 thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State exten-



1 sion service which, with other feed available will provide the  
2 minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock.  
3 The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property,  
4 and funds of any agency of the United States Department of  
5 Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for  
6 carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies  
7 so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which  
8 are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs  
9 and administrative expenses necessary in performing such  
10 functions.”



---

## A BILL

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. YOUNG

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2514

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as part of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of  
8       the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of  
10      Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county



1 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
2 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
3 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally  
4 used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined  
5 that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of  
6 the land. Such program in any county shall be made avail-  
7 able to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain  
8 available for a period of not less than three years after the  
9 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

10 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
11 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
12 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
13 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
14 program to accomplish its objective, taking into considera-  
15 tion the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available  
16 for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
17 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
18 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive  
19 months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from  
20 the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results  
21 in overgrazing non-deferred areas. Payment to any person  
22 for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not ex-  
23 ceed \$5,000 for any one year.

24 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include  
25 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically

1 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration.  
2  
3 The program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program concurrently.

8 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

13 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as follows:

16 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-

1 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
2 State extension service which, with other feed available, will  
3 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
4 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facil-  
5 ities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
6 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
7 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
8 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodities  
9 furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranch-  
10 men, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in  
11 performing such functions.”





---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2535

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. ASPINALL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2   *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3   That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4   tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5   the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6   ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7   amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8   of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9   and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of

1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county af-  
2 fected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be  
3 a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally  
5 used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined  
6 that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of  
7 the land. Such program in any county shall be made avail-  
8 able to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain  
9 available for a period of not less than three years after the  
10 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
14 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
15 program to accomplish its objective, taking into considera-  
16 tion the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for  
17 carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the de-  
19 ferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive  
20 months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from  
21 the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results  
22 in overgrazing non-deferred areas. Payment to any person  
23 for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not  
24 exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no pay-  
7 ment shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing  
8 under this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the  
25 disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of rough-



1 age, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination  
2 thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State exten-  
3 sion service which, with other feed available will provide the  
4 minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock.  
5 The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property,  
6 and funds of any agency of the United States Department of  
7 Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for  
8 carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies  
9 so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which  
10 are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs  
11 and administrative expenses necessary in performing such  
12 functions.”



---

# A BILL

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. ASPINALL

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2543

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. EDMONDSON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of  
8       the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate and  
9       carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agri-



1 culture, a deferred grazing program in any county affected  
2 by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be a  
3 substantial factor in agricultural production. Such program  
4 shall be applicable only to land which is normally used for  
5 grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made avail-  
8 able to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain  
9 available for a period of not less than three years after the  
10 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
14 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
15 program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration  
16 the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for  
17 carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive  
20 months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from  
21 the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results  
22 in overgrazing non-deferred areas. Payment to any person  
23 for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not  
24 exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition  
5 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county  
6 authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall  
7 be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this  
8 and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-  
15 first Congress (Act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
25 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of

1 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available, will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
6 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
9 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodi-  
10 ties furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
11 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
12 sary in performing such functions."





---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. EDMONDSON

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

ONE COPY ONLY  
TO BE KEPT

# H. R. 3111

IN SENATE, MAY 14, 1908.

REPORT

OF THE  
COMMISSIONERS OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE,  
IN RESPONSE TO A RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE,  
PASSED MAY 14, 1908.

## A BILL

TO AMEND AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE SURVEY AND  
CONVEYANCE OF LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES,  
AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE SURVEY AND CONVEYANCE OF  
LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES, AND TO  
AMEND AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE SURVEY AND  
CONVEYANCE OF LANDS BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES.

1. And moved for the same to be read / 1. And moved



85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3111

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 16, 1957

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas introduced the following bill; which was referred to the  
Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the ter-  
10 mination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
15 program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration  
16 the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for  
17 carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
20 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred  
21 areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in over-  
22 grazing non-deferred areas. Payment to any person for  
23 deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed  
24 \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such

1 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
2 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition  
5 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county  
6 authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall  
7 be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this  
8 and any other program concurrently.

9       SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14       SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17       “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any  
18 major disaster determined by the President to warrant assis-  
19 tance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875,  
20 Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to  
21 furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
25 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of

1 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
6 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
9 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodities  
10 furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen,  
11 and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in per-  
12 forming such functions.”





## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas

JANUARY 16, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture





85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3519

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 23, 1957

Mr. DIXON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3      That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4      tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5      the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6      ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7      amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8      of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9      and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
10 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consid-  
16 eration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available  
17 for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the de-  
19 ferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecu-  
20 tive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock  
21 from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch  
22 results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any  
23 person for deferred gazing on land in any one county shall  
24 not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration.  
4 The program authorized herein for any county shall be in  
5 addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect  
25 of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types

1 of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facil-  
6 ities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
9 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodi-  
10 ties furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
11 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
12 sary in performing such functions."





A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DIXON

JANUARY 23, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture





85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3607

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 24, 1957

Mr. CHRISTOPHER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That, notwithstanding any other provision of law in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed, as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county af-  
2 fected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be  
3 a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termina-  
10 tion of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land  
14 in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the  
15 program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration  
16 the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for  
17 carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors.  
18 No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred  
19 grazing is for a period of less than twelve consecutive months,  
20 or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the de-  
21 ferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in  
22 overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person  
23 for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not ex-  
24 ceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition  
5 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county  
6 authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall  
7 be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this  
8 and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eight-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
25 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of

1 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available  
4 will provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic  
5 herd of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel,  
6 facilities, property, and funds of any agency of the United  
7 States Department of Agriculture, including Commodity  
8 Credit Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall  
9 reimburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any com-  
10 modities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers  
11 or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses  
12 necessary in performing such functions."







REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE LAND OFFICE  
FOR THE YEAR 1880

ALBANY, N. Y., 1881.

FOR OFFICIAL PURPOSES

PRINTED BY THE COMMISSIONER OF THE LAND OFFICE  
ALBANY, N. Y., 1881.

A BILT

ALBANY, N. Y., 1881.

---

---

A BILL

---

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

---

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER

---

---

JANUARY 24, 1957  
Referred to the Committee on Agriculture







85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 885

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 25, 1957

Mr. CARLSON introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of

1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the ter-  
10 mination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program if  
19 the deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve  
20 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of  
21 livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm  
22 or ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment  
23 to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county  
24 shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such

1 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
2 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated  
11 for the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress,  
12 such funds as are necessary to carry out the program author-  
13 ized herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
25 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of



1 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
6 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall re-  
9 imburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any com-  
10 modities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
11 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
12 sary in performing such functions."



---

# A BILL

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. CARLSON

---

JANUARY 25, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry





## A BILL

TO AMEND AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF THE  
 BUSINESS OF INSURANCE, AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE  
 REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE, AND TO  
 PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE

OF THE

LEGISLATURE

OF THE STATE OF

# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued January 30, 1957  
For actions of January 29, 1957  
85th-1st, No. 16

## CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....31	Food additives.....14,44	Property.....42
Alcohol.....7	Food stamp plan.....10	Recreation.....11
ASC committees.....12	Foreign aid.....4	Reports.....5,6
Banking and currency....40	Forestry.....11	Research.....7,36
Budget.....18,33	Grazing.....3	Safety.....38
CCC.....37	Holiday.....45	SCS.....5
Conservation.....32	Information.....27	Small business.....13
Corn.....1,31	Lands.....29	Soil bank.....23,32
Cotton.....17	Legal services.....39	Soil conservation....5,23
Defense production.....6	Loans, farm.....8,34	Surplus feed grain....37
Distressed areas.....41	Meat packing.....46	Surplus property.....43
Drought relief.....3,8,25	Natural resources.19,20,21	Taxation.....15
Electrification.....22,30	Personnel.....26	Trade, foreign.....9,17
Family-farm.....23	Poultry.....24	Transportation.....15
Farm program.....20	Prices.....46	Unemployment.....41
Feed.....3	support.....10	Water, utilization...16,22
Fertilizer.....21	Printing.....35	Wheat quotas.....2,28
Fish and wildlife.....36		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses received from USDA proposed bills on corn and wheat used on farm. House subcommittee ordered deferred grazing bill reported. Sen. Murray urged drought relief for Montana. Sen. Symington urged drought relief for Missouri. Sen. Humphrey criticized dismissal of Minn., ASC farmer committeeman. Sen. Wiley introduced and discussed bill re assaults and homicides to Federal employees. Sen. Ellender introduced bill to increase authority for Bankhead-Jones loans. (Continued on Page 6).

## HOUSE

1. CORN. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to provide for corn base acreages; to House Agriculture and Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committees. pp. 945, 1106
2. WHEAT. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to exempt certain wheat producers from liability where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm; to House Agriculture and Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committees. pp. 945, 1106
3. DROUGHT RELIEF. The Livestock and Feed Grains subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee ordered reported with amendment to the full committee H. R. 2367 to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program for drought-stricken areas. p. D49
4. FOREIGN AID. Debated, but took no final action on, H. J. Res. 117, to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations of the Middle East. pp. 1038-1101

5. SOIL CONSERVATION. Received from the Comptroller General a report on the audit of the Soil Conservation Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; to Government Operations Committee. p. 1106
6. REPORTS. Received the 44th annual report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; and a report from the Office of Defense Mobilization on the borrowing authority for the quarter ending September 30, 1956, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended. p. 1106

#### SENATE

7. RESEARCH. The Vice President presented a resolution of the Nebraska legislature favoring S. 581, to authorize the transfer of the alcohol-producing facility at Omaha, Neb., to this Department. p. 945
8. DROUGHT RELIEF. Sen. Murray criticized the lack of drought relief for five Mont., counties, presented a petition asking for FHA disaster loans, and inserted four news articles and a telegram. Sen. Mansfield concurred. pp. 945-948  
Sen. Symington criticized this Department for leaving Mo., out of the list of States receiving drought aid, and presented further arguments concerning the drought situation in southwest Mo.. Sen. Johnston added that S. C. seemed to be treated similarly. pp. 991-995
9. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Wiley inserted a petition from some Wisconsin farmers, urging increased farm exports.
10. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Langer inserted a resolution from the Minot (N.D) Farmers Union GTA, criticizing efforts to distribute the Secretary's book, and urging adoption of the food stamp plan. p. 988
11. FOREST RECREATION. Sen. Thye praised Operation Outdoors and inserted an editorial from the Minneapolis Star favoring the use of National Forests for recreation. pp. 987-988
12. ASC COMMITTEES. Sen. Humphrey criticized the dismissal of a Minnesota ASC committeeman, stating that legislation was needed to protect the rights of elected committeemen, and inserting a petition of farmers in support of the committeeman dismissed. pp. 995-998
13. SMALL BUSINESS. Passed without amendment S. 637, to increase the business loan authorization of the Small Business Administration to \$215 million. p. 1023

#### ITEMS IN THE APPENDIX

14. FOOD ADDITIVES. Sen. Hill inserted an address by Marx Leva on the "need for new, equitable, and workable food additive legislation." pp. A540-541
15. TRANSPORTATION TAXES. Rep. Van Zandt inserted a statement of the president of the Association of American Railroads favoring repeal of excise taxes on the transportation of persons and property. p. A548
16. WATER SUPPLIES. Rep. Kilday inserted an editorial supporting legislation to extend Federal financial assistance to construction of long-distance water pipelines by cities for needed water supplies. p. A549







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued February 1, 1957  
For actions of January 31, 1957  
85th - 1st, No. 18

## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....9	Food distribution.....3	Patents.....8
Appropriations.....2	Food stamp plan.....3	Personnel.....15
Budget.....11	Foreign aid.....6,13	Postal service.....16
Civil defense.....19	Forestry.....4	Small business.....5
Depressed areas.....12	Information.....14	Taxation.....17
Drought relief.....1	Insect control.....18	Transportation.....7
Electrification.....10	Loans.....5	Travel.....15
Farm program.....14	Mining.....4	Unemployment.....12
Feed.....1		

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported deferred grazing bill; to be debated Feb. 4. Rep. Sullivan criticized USDA position on food-stamp plan. House to debate urgent deficiency appropriation bill Feb. 5.

## HOUSE

1. DROUGHT RELIEF. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2367, to establish a deferred grazing program and protein feed program for drought-stricken areas (H. Rept. 23) (p. 1229); Rep. McCormack announced that this bill will be debated on Mon., Feb. 4 (p. 1217).
2. URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1957. Rep. McCormack announced that this bill will be debated on Tues., Feb. 5. p. 1217
3. FOOD DISTRIBUTION. Rep. Sullivan criticized the position of the Department relative to a food-stamp plan, stating that "the Department of Agriculture seemed bent on outlining a possible food-stamp plan of such scope and magnitude, involving some 25 millions persons, as to make the whole idea seem ridiculous and tear food-stamp plans to smithereens", and inserted a newspaper editorial in support of her position. pp. 1224-5
4. FORESTRY; MINING. Rep. Chudoff stated that the Interior Department now concurs in the conclusions of the Government Operations Committee, resulting from hte investigation of the Al Sarena Mining case, that the Administrative Procedure Act governs contests in mining claim cases, and inserted two newspaper articles commenting on this situation. pp. 1227-28

5. SMALL BUSINESS. Passed as reported H.R. 3109 to increase the loan authorization of the Small Business Administration for making loans to small business from \$150 to 230 million, and to increase the total loan authorization of the revolving fund from \$375 to \$455 million. The language of H.R. 3109 was substituted for that in S. 637, a similar bill, which was then passed. H.P. 3109 was laid on the table. pp. 1216-1217, 1219-1222  
Agreed to as reported H. Res. 56, authorizing a select committee to investigate the problems of all types of small business. p. 1219
6. FOREIGN AID. Rep. McGovern spoke on his reasons for opposing economic and military aid for the Middle East, and inserted a letter and magazine article in support of his position. pp. 1225-1227
7. TRANSPORTATION. Received the 70th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission. p. 1229
8. PATENTS. A Judiciary Committee subcommittee ordered reported without amendment to the full Committee H.R. 103, to authorize the National Inventors Council to make awards for inventive contributions relating to the national defense. p. D58
9. ADJOURNED until Mon., Feb. 4. p. 1229

#### ITEMS IN THE APPENDIX

10. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Van Zandt favoring the atomic energy power program in light of the generally sound fuels situation (coal, oil, natural gas). pp. A639-640  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Scudder favoring private construction of the Niagara River power projects, and inserting an editorial to that effect. pp. A645-646  
Rep. Johnson inserted a letter from the Buffalo, Wis., Electric Cooperative urging that private power propaganda advertising be stopped. p. A673
11. BUDGET. Rep. Canfield inserted Secretary Humphrey's Jan. 27 interview on Meet the Press, in which the Secretary urged continued efforts to cut the budget. pp. A640-642  
Rep. Gross inserted an editorial stating that in the conflict between the President and Secretary Humphrey, "Secretary Humphrey is the one talking sense." pp. A643-644  
Rep. Wharton inserted an editorial, "Cut the Budget", which urges Congress to cut out all unnecessary items. p. A649
12. REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT. Rep. Flood inserted a letter from the Plymouth, Pa., Business and Professional Men's Association, urging an area redevelopment program for areas suffering unemployment. pp. A647-648
13. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Hosmer inserted a letter favoring foreign loans rather than outright gifts. pp. A665-666  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Farbstein favoring the Middle East Resolution (H. J. Res. 117) but insisting that it does not deal with the basic causes of the tension. p. A666
14. INFORMATION; FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Johnson inserted an editorial from the Madison, Wis., Capital-Times, decrying the tax-deductible donations asked in campaign to secure funds to mail the Secretary's book, Farmers at the Crossroads, to all Wisconsin farmers, and also inserted a copy of the letter sent to possible contributors. p. A672



## DEFERRED GRAZING PROGRAM

---

JANUARY 31, 1957.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 2367]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 3, beginning on line 14, strike out all of section 5.

Amend the title of the bill to read:

A bill to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to establish in drought disaster areas where grazing is important to agricultural production an emergency drought program designed to protect dry pasturelands from further damage by grazing and to aid in the reestablishment of grass and sod when the drought has been broken. It would do this by setting up a deferred grazing program under which farmers and ranchers in drought-stricken areas would receive annual payments roughly equivalent to the normal rental value of their grazing lands for keeping stock off of pastures under agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture until the grass has had an opportunity to recover from drought conditions.

The program would be operated through and as part of the disaster-relief program of the Federal Government and is limited in its application to those areas which because of a major disaster due to drought



have been determined by the President to warrant assistance under Public Law 875, 81st Congress.

The term "deferred grazing" is well understood in the rangeland areas of the country. It means temporarily removing livestock from pastures so as to prevent excessively close grazing and permanent damage to the range under drought conditions and so that, after a drought has been broken, grass may have an opportunity to grow and reseed itself before again being pastured. The program embodied in this bill was recommended by the State Drought Committee of Texas, which considers it one of the most important steps which can be taken to protect the rangeland resources of the country and to assist farmers and ranchers in drought-stricken areas.

The bill reported herewith was introduced by Representative Poage, of Texas, chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains, but hearings were held on a number of similar bills including:

- H. R. 2357, by Mr. Albert
- H. R. 2358, by Mr. Brooks of Texas
- H. R. 2359, by Mr. Burleson
- H. R. 2360, by Mr. Dempsey
- H. R. 2361, by Mr. Dies
- H. R. 2362, by Mr. Dowdy
- H. R. 2363, by Mr. Fisher
- H. R. 2364, by Mr. Ikard
- H. R. 2365, by Mr. Kilgore
- H. R. 2366, by Mr. Mahon
- H. R. 2368, by Mr. Rogers of Texas
- H. R. 2369, by Mr. Rutherford
- H. R. 2370, by Mr. Thornberry
- H. R. 2371, by Mr. Wright
- H. R. 2372, by Mr. Young
- H. R. 2514, by Mr. Thompson of Texas
- H. R. 2535, by Mr. Aspinall
- H. R. 2543, by Mr. Edmondson
- H. R. 3111, by Mr. Teague of Texas
- H. R. 3519, by Mr. Dixon
- H. R. 3607, by Mr. Christopher

Under section 2 the rate of deferred grazing payments will be determined by establishing as a base rate for each county the average rental value of private grazing land in the county during periods of average precipitation when forage on grazing land was normal. The base rate for the county will then be modified by the specified considerations, including inducement of participation, availability of funds, and other factors pertinent to the accomplishment of the objectives of the act. The established rate for the county will then be adjusted as to land on which grazing is to be deferred so as to reflect the comparable rental value of the individual tracts.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amendment strikes from the bill all of section 5 which would have authorized and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to include protein feed concentrates in the emergency feed program. As amended, the bill relates only to the single subject of a deferred grazing program, without any reference to the emergency feed program.

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2367

[Report No. 23]

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 10, 1957

Mr. PoAGE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JANUARY 31, 1957

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through]

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of

1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the ter-  
10 mination of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program if  
19 the deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve  
20 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of  
21 livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm  
22 or ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment  
23 to any person for deferred gazing on land in any one county  
24 shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such



1 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
2 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated  
11 for the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress,  
12 such funds as are necessary to carry out the program author-  
13 ized herein.

14 SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress  
15 (~~Act of April 6, 1949~~), is amended to read as follows:

16 “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
17 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
18 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875,  
19 ~~Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855)~~, as amended, to  
20 furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
21 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
22 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
23 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
24 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of  
25 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-



1 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
2 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
3 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
4 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
5 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
6 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
7 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall re-  
8 imburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any com-  
9 modities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
10 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
11 sary in performing such functions."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes."



---

# A BILL

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. Poage

---

JANUARY 10, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JANUARY 31, 1957

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed





[August 21, 2021]

## A BILL

to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain transfers of property to a trust for the benefit of a minor, and for other purposes.

IN SENATE,

August 21, 2021.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

U. S. SENATE,

IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued February 5, 1957  
For actions of February 4, 1957  
85th.-1st, No. 20

## CONTENTS

Access roads.....37	Food stamp.....46	Reclamation.....24,52
Adjournment.....12	Forestry.....37	Research.....47
Anti-dumping.....3	Grazing.....43	Reports.....22
Appropriations.....14,54	Information.....30,44	Rural libraries.....30
Budget.....2,19,32	Interest rates.....20	Small business.....10,27
Civil defense.....17,48	Lands.....33	Soil bank.....35
Committee assignments.....11	Loans.....20	Super-grades.....15
Conservation.....41	farm.....40	Statehood.....5,31
Cooperatives.....45	Marketing.....8,38	Taxation.....45
Corn.....28	Monopolies.....29	Territories.....31
Cotton.....35	Natural resources.....9	Trade, foreign.....3,16
Depressed areas.....39	Parity prices.....21	TVA.....26
Drought relief.....1,13	Personnel.....15,34	Unemployment.....39
Education.....47	Plywood.....16	Virgin Islands.....23
Electrification.....7,18,36	Poultry.....4,25	Watersheds.....49
Farm income.....42	Property.....53	Wheat.....8,50
Farm program.....6	Purchasing.....51	

HIGHLIGHTS (See Page 6.)

## SENATE

1. DROUGHT RELIEF. Sen. Symington urged immediate action on drought relief for Missouri, and inserted his statement of Jan. 28 before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, in rebuttal to the news release of Jan. 23 by Mr. Scott. pp. 1301-1302
2. BUDGET. Sen. Johnston protested the size of the budget and urged the Senate to consider making the Budget Bureau an arm of the Congress. He inserted an editorial by David Lawrence, "The Budget That's Too High." p. 1301
3. FOREIGN TRADE. Both Houses received a report from Treasury on the Anti-dumping Act, with draft of legislation for its improvement; to Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee.
4. POULTRY. Received a resolution from the Calif. Senate asking for relief for poultry producers in Calif. p. 1277
5. TERRITORIES. Received from the Alaska Legislature a petition for statehood. p. 1278

6. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution of the Taylor County (Minn.) Farmers Union urging 100% parity, 51 million acre corn base, Government crop insurance, and more soil bank payments. p. 1280
7. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution of the Northern Electric Co-op, Virginia, Minn., protesting against private power propaganda advertising. p. 1280
8. MARKETING. Sen. Humphrey commended the Department's use of private trade channels in exporting wheat, urged the same program be considered for cotton, and inserted his remarks in 1956 urging this be done and a magazine article on "Grain Marketing and the Government." pp. 1306-1308
9. NATURAL RESOURCES. Passed without amendment, S. J. Res. 35, a National Conservation Anniversary Commission to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the first governors conference on protecting natural resources. pp. 1310-1311
10. SMALL BUSINESS. Agreed to the assignment of majority members to the Select Committee on Small Business. p. 1321
11. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry Subcommittees;
  - Soil Conservation and Forestry: Eastland (Chmn.), Johnston, Scott. Aiken, Thye.
  - Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification: Holland (Chmn.), Scott, Talmadge. Mundt, Schoeppel.
  - Agricultural Production, Marketing and Stabilization: Johnston (Chmn.), Holland, Humphrey. Aiken, Young.
  - Agricultural Research and General Legislation: Humphrey (Chmn.), Eastland, Symington. Hickenlooper, Williams.
  - Tobacco Industry: Scott (Chmn.), Talmadge. Schoeppel.
12. ADJOURNED until Thurs., Feb. 7. p. 1322

HOUSE

13. DROUGHT RELIEF. Rep. Cooley announced postponement "at this time" of consideration of H.R. 2367, to establish a deferred grazing program for drought-stricken areas, because this Department "does object to the consideration of this bill, as reported, at this time." (p. 1335). Several other representatives discussed the seriousness of the drought situation, and criticized the position of this Department relative to present consideration of this bill (pp. 1335, 1338, 1339, 1353).
14. URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1957. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill (H.R. 4249) Feb. 1 without amendment pursuant to a previous order of the House (H. Rept. 24) (p. 1357). This bill is scheduled to be debated today (p. 1367).
15. PERSONNEL. Rep. Davis urged better utilization of scientists and engineers in the Federal service, and inserted a letter he had received from the Defense Department on the utilization of such personnel working on military contracts. pp. 1330-1331



85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 4259

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 4, 1957

Mr. BREEDING introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed, as part of  
8       the assistance provided pursuant to such Act, to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of



1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county af-  
2 fected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be  
3 a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
10 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
12 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
13 rates not less than the average annual rental value of graz-  
14 ing land in the county as will induce sufficient participation  
15 in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program if  
19 the deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve con-  
20 secutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of live-  
21 stock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or  
22 ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to  
23 any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county  
24 shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include

1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purpose and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9       SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated  
11 for the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress,  
12 such funds as are necessary to carry out the program author-  
13 ized herein.

14       SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17       “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
25 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of

1 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available, will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facili-  
6 ties, property, and funds of any agency of the United States  
7 Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit  
8 Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reim-  
9 burse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodi-  
10 ties furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or  
11 ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses neces-  
12 sary in performing such functions.”





## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BREEDING

FEBRUARY 4, 1957

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

beautiful community, but they see their husbands working too hard and gradually being more impressed than they should by the endless flattery that goes with power.

Men, such as Dulles and Nixon and Stassen, get inured to criticism, for they dish it out; they love the struggle and they get the satisfactions of pride and position. But what of their wives?

This is one of the endless perils of official life in Washington. The men learn to say a lot of things without disclosing anything. Indeed, saying nothing at great length eventually becomes a rather pleasant official game. But their women are accustomed before they come here to saying what they think, and it is only later that they discover that outgoing spontaneity is a menace to themselves and their husbands.

"I've been very, very careful," said Mrs. Wilson. "But you reach a point sometimes—and this was it."

### RESPONSIBILITY FOR REDUCING THE BUDGET

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a few days ago, when the President submitted his annual budget, press reports indicated that it was his desire that the Congress trim the budget. How unrealistic and unfair is such a statement. It should be apparent not only to the members of the press but to every Member of Congress that the Budget Bureau has hundreds and hundreds of employees. There are hundreds and hundreds of employees in every department and agency of the Government. If all these employees who are completely under the direction of the President and other executive officers are unable to cut the budget, I wonder how in the name of high heaven the American people can believe that the Members of Congress, with their limited staffs and investigating committees, are capable of doing so. I saw figures the other day which tended to show that this administration has spent in its first 4 years \$65 billion more than was spent under President Truman's administration. We had a war to finance, too, the Korean war, during the period covered by President Truman's figures.

It is just another buck-passing game. We will be compelled to pass the budget in substantially the form in which it is submitted, because we do not have the facilities to analyze adequately the giveaway programs and the spending sprees engaged in by every branch of the Government.

I, as one Senator, intend to vote for reductions in the appropriation bills as they come to the floor of the Senate.

The cure for this situation may be to make the Budget Bureau an independent arm of the Government answerable to the Congress only. We get the blame for high spending and our failure to reduce taxes, yet we are asked to rubber-stamp every program the executive sends to Congress. In most cases the emergency is so imminent there is no alternative. Let us consider making the Budget Bureau an arm of the Congress, as is the General Accounting Office.

I wish to alert the Congress to the fact that if we do not stop our wild spending we will spend ourselves into bankruptcy. We cannot remain economically strong unless we reduce taxes, reduce our budg-

et, and retire our large national debt. In my opinion, the first step to be taken should be reducing the Government's indebtedness.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Budget That's Too High," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U. S. News & World Report of February 8, 1957.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE BUDGET THAT'S TOO HIGH (By David Lawrence)

Seventy-two billions of dollars is a big sum of money for a Federal budget. It is an amount difficult, even for Members of Congress, to evaluate. They cannot possibly familiarize themselves with the wide variety of items in a budget.

Someday the American people will demand that the system of budgetmaking be reformed. Today's methods are obsolete and inadequate. The Government is too big to be run as it was 36 years ago when the present budget law was passed.

For the truth is Congress created a Bureau of the Budget but made it a subdivision of the Office of the President. It gave no power to the Budget Director himself to change the estimates furnished by heads of departments and other governmental agencies. It made the Budget Director only a sort of information gatherer for the President. It did not even require the Budget Director to be confirmed by the Senate.

No member of the Cabinet—not even the Secretary of the Treasury—has the official duty of reviewing the whole budget to determine what items should be included or eliminated.

The President receives estimates from each department or agency and depends on the Director of the Budget for explanatory data. But the decision in the last analysis as to how much shall be included must, by law, be made by the President himself.

Does anybody believe for a moment that any President can make a detailed examination or review of a present-day budget of the Government of the United States and do anything else?

There are, of course, items that do not change from year to year—obligations that grow out of existing laws or previous commitments. The President cannot, for instance, assume that certain laws will be repealed even though he may dislike them, yet they involve recurrent expenditures of many billions every year.

A President, to be sure, is the head of the Government and represents the national interest. He cannot be biased in favor of this or that special interest or locality. He must weigh judicially the demands of pressure groups. He must be sensitive to public opinion—for the continuance of his party in power depends on whether he has in general satisfied the wishes of the electorate.

When the budget law was passed in 1921, it was recognized that officials of the various departments might not be satisfied with the sums allotted to them in the budget and might complain to Congress. Strict regulations—which are still in force—were, therefore, issued by the President forbidding executive department employees from going to Congress to obtain higher appropriations than those set forth in the budget. This has been ingeniously circumvented by Congress itself. Officials are usually invited to testify at congressional hearings, and from them is elicited the information on which champions of particular causes base their demands for enlarged appropriations.

The voting of about a billion dollars more than the President and the armed services themselves asked for at the last session of

Congress was so transparently the result of political demagoguery and collusion with overzealous advocates of larger spending within the executive departments that the incident makes one wonder whether strong laws rather than mere regulations should not hereafter govern the behavior of executive employees who connive with Members of Congress to lobby for increases in the budget.

In all fairness, however, it must be said that the armament-spending group doubtless felt it was as much entitled to the taxpayers' money as the groups pressing for some of the so-called "welfare" items in the budget.

But who is to weigh all the facts and say for what the taxpayers' money shall be spent? The budget recently presented by the President was, according to his own admission, very high. He said he hoped it could be cut.

Congress has the sole duty of deciding what the final budget shall be. Under the British and Canadian system, the budget is submitted by the Prime Minister and then the Parliament must accept or reject it as it is, for both the executive and the legislative branch are controlled by the same political party. In America, where divided government prevails today, the people pay a high price for their failure to fix responsibility in a single party.

Someday Congress should set up large enough committees with proper staffs—perhaps a joint committee of both Houses—to study continuously throughout each year the workings of the budget system and gather the necessary information to guide Congress.

Nobody likes the size of the new budget—neither the President nor the Congress. Certainly the taxpayers don't like it. For they see the Federal budget going higher and higher, with no relief in sight from heavy taxes on the incomes of individuals and businesses.

How much longer will taxpayers tolerate such a haphazard system of budget making as we have today?

### DROUGHT RELIEF IN MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on Friday, February 1, in Jefferson City, the Governor of Missouri held a meeting of the Missouri State Drought Committee, at which time the committee presented their problems to Mr. Harry Thomas, latest of the investigators representing the Department of Agriculture, who have come to our State. Governor Blair was kind enough to ask me to this meeting. Because of what this problem means to Missouri, I was very glad to attend.

Mr. President, as a result of what was presented to Mr. Thomas in Jefferson City, on last Friday, I am confident something will be done for Missouri, unless again the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture representative are reversed in Washington.

As mentioned, last week we did obtain for some counties the right to have some emergency credit, but neither this nor hay can be of much help at this time. Farmers who have suffered 5 years from problems caused by drought cannot do much with credit alone.

What our farmers need badly, and need now, is the right to participate in the grain program on a basis comparable with that right already extended to 12 other States, in many of which the drought problem does not even compare in severity with that in Missouri.

This situation has now dragged for so long, that hundreds of our farmers have already been forced to the wall. Urgent



action is needed; else hundreds more will go bankrupt at the same time that they see the great grain stocks held by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, on January 28, a January 23d release from the Department of Agriculture, having to do with the current critical drought problem in Missouri, was placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It had not been my purpose to dwell further on this release; but inasmuch as it has been placed in the RECORD, I now ask unanimous consent that my reply to it, which I presented to Secretary Benson last week at a meeting of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MISSOURI ON FEDERAL DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

This statement is in reply to a statement issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, on Wednesday, January 23, with respect to my continued protests about the way the drought-aid situation is being handled in Missouri by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Secretary Benson's latest effort to justify discrimination against Missouri farmers in his administration of the drought program, as released by one of his men on January 23, is most misleading.

This statement says in part:

"Missouri farmers have already received Federal emergency assistance totaling over \$32 million from Department of Agriculture disaster programs in the fiscal years 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957 up to November 30. This has been aid in the form of emergency credit, feed, and hay assistance, and free food distribution."

What he did not say was that, since July 1, 1955, little or no new emergency credit, and not one cent of assistance for a pound of hay, or grain, has been allowed a Missouri farmer; and we are talking about drought conditions today—not in 1954.

The "free food" distribution comment referred to in this drought-release statement has nothing to do with the drought program; and I am told amounts to but some \$30,000.

At the same time Mr. Benson refused Missouri farmers such aid as provided by the Congress; he has been pouring it into other States, including some which border on Missouri.

Drought doesn't end at a State boundary. The Department of Agriculture has described Missouri as a State having "extreme drought," the worst category listed for any State.

In his January 23 press release, Mr. Benson says: "As a result of a recent survey, the Secretary of Agriculture has declared 28 counties in Missouri eligible for emergency loans through the facilities of the Farmers' Home Administration under Public Law 38."

What he does not say, however, is that the emergency loan approval came only last week, after many months effort on the part of some of us to obtain that approval.

As Greene County Agent Clyde Clubb recently emphasized, no hay program "could get rolling in less than 5 or 6 weeks, but by that time it would be too late."

Steadily worsening drought conditions in Missouri were first called to the attention of Mr. Benson personally when he met with the Missouri State Drought Committee on October 10, but inspectors were not sent to the State until the latter part of November; and then only following a personal trip to Washington by Missouri Commissioner of Agriculture Clelie Carpenter.

Secretary Benson continues in the press

release of January 23, "It would be very timely for the State officials to demonstrate their expressed concern about the plight of the farm people by taking some positive steps to provide some State aid programs."

"Throughout the past several months, when spokesmen for the State have been vigorous in their efforts to get large Federal-aid programs into operation, we have not been informed that the State officials have taken any steps to have State funds appropriated to aid their farm people in meeting drought problems."

This statement is misleading and Mr. Benson should know it, because he also knows that on Tuesday of last week, the day before he announced this emergency credit for 28 counties, Missouri Gov. James T. Blair, Jr., personally called on Mr. Benson in Washington. At that time Governor Blair asked for specific suggestions as to what more the State could do.

Mr. Benson knows, and the record so shows, that for many months former Governor Donnelly and the Missouri congressional delegation have been sending continuous pleas to him, to his aides, and even to President Eisenhower, himself, urging that something be done in this tragic matter.

In fact, in Governor Donnelly's wire of October 23 to President Eisenhower, the Governor stated, "My staff members and I will be available to meet with your representatives at any time and I urge immediate action \* \* \*"

In his inaugural address in Jefferson City, January 14, Governor Blair stated that he intended to ask for an emergency drought fund so Missouri could continue to meet its fair responsibility. A bill to cover this recommendation is already in the Missouri State Senate, S. 49; and is due for hearing this week.

The implications from Mr. Benson therefore that the officials of Missouri have not "taken any steps" or "expressed concern" is not correct—and the record so proves.

We Missourians are very proud of our record on State drought aid. We challenge Mr. Benson, or anyone else, to show any State that has done better, or even as much, in percentage of cash drought appropriation as against assistance from the Federal Government.

Although we are not sure, we are told that the appropriations of Missouri for drought aid are more than that of all other States combined.

This press release of Mr. Benson then uses figures showing good production of grain in Missouri last year as an excuse for the Department of Agriculture not designating Missouri counties for grain assistance.

The 1954 Census of Agriculture shows that the 28 counties most seriously affected by the drought have an average of only 1.4 percent of their land in corn; and this production is almost entirely for silage.

Because of the terrain in these counties, other grains are similarly light.

The emergency drought program is supposedly designed to aid beef and dairy farmers, so that they can carry their foundation herds through to normal seasons. The fact that a grain farmer in another area of the State had a good crop does not help the dairy farmer who depends upon pasture to carry him through to December 15.

When the drought came this year, the latter had to start buying and feeding grain and hay in July and August.

The figures of the Department of Agriculture show that Missouri pastures were in as bad condition as any of the 12 States which were designated for hay and grain assistance; in fact, only 2 of these 12 States—Texas and Oklahoma—were ranked as low as Missouri in percentage of normal pasture.

Mr. Benson's release then says, "Senator Symington can hardly be serious in his talk of feed shortages" and then he gives figures for feed production in all Missouri.

Again this is misleading, because as Mr. Benson should know, the drought-stricken parts of Missouri are largely pasture land, with very little grain production—and pasture land and hay production in this area were practically nil during the latter half of 1956.

In addition, the percentages which Mr. Benson gives in this release are estimated; and in the interest of accuracy the release should have so stated.

Mr. Benson's release then questions my statement that cattlemen have been forced to sacrifice their herds and gives as the reason the fact there were just as many cattle and calves in Missouri on January 1, 1957, as there were a year earlier.

Again, he uses figures for the whole State, not just the drought area. Mr. Benson's approach to the problem would appear to be like that of a man who, because of his fondness for hoarding wealth, refuses to let a doctor operate on his sick child, on the grounds his other children are abnormally healthy.

Now as to the facts:

The Producers' Creamery Co. with plants in Springfield, Monett, Cabool, Eldorado Springs, and Lebanon in the drought-stricken southwest section of Missouri have already lost 6 percent of their patrons—660 to be exact—in 1956.

These farmers, in the main operating family size farms, were forced to sell their herds.

The same loss in milk patrons is reported by the other creameries in this area.

Mr. Benson's own Department, in figures released on January 11 and 17 of this month, shows that the above statements he released on Missouri milk production tell only part of the story, and are therefore misleading.

According to USDA reports, in December 1956, Missouri milk production was 6 million pounds below the same month in 1955, this at the same time that 5 of the States receiving drought assistance showed an increase in milk production.

It is welcome news that under the growing pressure of officials and citizens of Missouri, Mr. Benson is now sending another inspector to the drought-stricken counties of our State.

Mr. Benson can have the dubious satisfaction, however, of knowing that in recent months his policies have removed hundreds of small Missouri farmers from their land.

We trust that the recommendations of any additional inspectors who come to Missouri will be followed in Washington—and not be overruled by centralized Agriculture there, as we understand were the recommendations of the previous inspectors who visited Missouri.

What worries me, at least as much as anything, about Mr. Benson's statement is his doubt I was serious in the matter.

How can any representative of the people in a State not be serious, when conditions in that State are as follows:

(1) Farmers in large areas of Missouri are being forced to sell their foundation herds because they have no feed.

(2) These farmers see large quantities of this feed in Government storage. They know also that Mr. Benson is constantly bemoaning the size of these surplus stocks.

(3) These Missouri farmers look across State boundaries into Kansas and Oklahoma and see farmers in those States feed grain supplied them by their Government, help which has been repeatedly denied to our farmers in Missouri, over these tragic months.

I want to assure Mr. Benson that I am very serious about this matter.

**COMMENDATION OF SENATOR CLARK**

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of us had high expectations for outstanding leadership from the new junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr.



below that level who frequently fail to reach their full development as a student until reaching older ages.

We know that all of our leadership of today has not been recruited from the top third of an earlier college generation, and unless we assure that these young Americans shall continue their education, we may be losing top leadership for tomorrow.

### BOY SCOUT WEEK

(Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter.)

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America chartered by the Congress is celebrating its 47th anniversary this week. Since its establishment it has had in excess of 26 million boys and leaders enrolled, and all have committed themselves to live up to the principles of the Scout oath and law. At the end of 1956 there were 4½ million Scouts and leaders enrolled, the highest record for membership in the Boy Scouts of America.

Through numerous training courses in all parts of the Nation, volunteer leaders are receiving training in unit administration and programing so that our boys will enjoy the best possible scouting experience.

In July of 1957 the Boy Scouts of America will conduct its 4th National Jamboree at Valley Forge when 50,000 Scouts, explorers and leaders will assemble for a week's encampment. This great patriotic gathering is part of the Scout's program "Onward for God and My Country." Another history making assembly of Scouts will take place in England when the 100th anniversary of the birth of Lord Baden-Powell, founder of the Boy Scout movement, and the 50th anniversary of the establishment of scouting in the world will be observed at a jubilee jamboree. Sixteen hundred American boys will attend.

The Boy Scouts of America has also engaged in an international exchange of nearly 300 young men with 11 nations of Europe, Asia, and Latin America thus strengthening the World Brotherhood of Scouting.

I am happy to call attention to the patriotic service of this great organization on the occasion of its anniversary. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following message from the President congratulating the Scouts upon their progress and achievements.

*To the Boy Scouts of America:*

As the American people observe Boy Scout Week, they are—I am confident—proud of the more than 4½ million boys and leaders now carrying on the Scout program of character development, citizenship training, and physical fitness. Since 1910, when this program was inaugurated, 26 million young Americans and their leaders have been active in it, constituting a tremendous force for wholesome living in our national life. Certainly the Boy Scout program is a distinctive contribution to a better and stronger America.

In July, during the National Jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa., the Nation will witness a tremendous rallying of the boys and men of the Scout movement. There, they will dem-

onstrate the skills, the capacity for cooperative work, the ability to do things as a united team that they have learned in scouting. My best wishes go to the 50,000 who will attend. I am sure that once again they will be inspired by their encampment on that hallowed ground, and that in their conduct there and at home when they return they will prove themselves worthy heirs to their heroic forebears.

As all of you go forward with your 4-year program, "Onward For God and My Country," I extend to each and every one of you my warmest regards and best wishes for another year of accomplishment.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

### DROUGHT RELIEF

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to call up today the bill H. R. 2367 and ask for its passage under suspension of the rules. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] on January 10. On January 12 and 13 the idea was proposed to the President on the drought trip. On January 17 a report was requested by telephone from the Department. On January 23 and 25 hearings were held by the subcommittee. On January 29, the executive session of the committee was held and the bill was unanimously reported after the one section, which became controversial, was deleted. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee, and we had every reason to believe it would have the support of the officials of the Department of Agriculture. But, it developed at our committee meeting this morning, that the Department of Agriculture does object to the consideration of this bill, as reported, at this time. In view of this opposition, which I think is very, very unfortunate, I shall not ask for its consideration under suspension of the rules at this time, but will probably ask for it to be consideration under suspension at a later date, or we will obtain a rule and ask for its consideration under a rule. The bill deals with what we consider to be a very severe and grave problem. The drought areas of the country were visited by President Eisenhower in person. The Department of Agriculture has certainly been aware of the distressing situation for many, many long weeks and it is unfortunate, after the bill had been considered and public hearings had been held, that Mr. True Morse of the Department of Agriculture came before the committee this morning and objected to the consideration of this bill. I just want to report to the House why I am not calling up the bill for consideration at this time, and fix the responsibility for the delay in the consideration of this very important and meritorious measure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that the House Committee on Agriculture is unanimously in favor of immediate passage of this bill. It is now apparent that relief will be delayed if not denied to those who are suffering in the drought areas of our Nation, and the Secretary of Agriculture is entirely responsible for this delay. When asked why officials of the Department of Ag-

riculture were opposed to the bill, we received the usual answer—a committee has been studying the problems involved and have not yet reported. In other words, officials of the Department of Agriculture are fiddling while the farm lands of America are burning and parching and farmers are in great distress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

### DROUGHT LEGISLATION

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, my chairman [Mr. COOLEY] has explained the reason for the failure to carry out the ordinary legislative processes in connection with the drought bill. It seems to me this is one of the most tragic things to come before this House. The committee held extensive hearings and the Department's own witness, the head of the Drouth Division, Mr. Kenneth L. Scott, appeared before the committee. Every page of this extensive record is his testimony. He did not tell us that the Department opposed the bill. He did not tell us that they wanted extra time for any studies of anything else. He said, "We need something." Although he would not approve of all of the details of the bill.

The committee made its own decision and brought out what is believed to be a fine and fair bill. I want to say for all of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, everyone voted for it—everyone. There was no objection to this bill after it was finally brought out, and I do not think there is any objection to it now. I do not think there is any man on this floor who will stand up and tell us why we should not consider it except that the Department does not want to consider drought relief unless it is their drought relief.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Can the gentleman tell us how the committee first learned about the Department's attitude on this drought legislation?

Mr. POAGE. We read it in the newspapers, and that is where we usually find out about the Department's attitude.

Had the Department been as interested in helping drought sufferers as they said they were down at San Angelo, we could have already had one bill passed.

The minority leader did not think that the House was acting with too much haste when we passed the administration's bill to aid drought sufferers in the Middle East last week. Why should he be disturbed now when the committee finally acts after 3 weeks of study? Are we to understand that the trouble with our ranchmen is that they live in the valleys of the Cimarron, the Canadian, and the Red, rather than in the valleys of the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Nile? Or could it be that only those bills which bear the name of a



modern Republican could be expected to save the soil?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

#### IRAN

(Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and include a statement by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy on Iran.)

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced into the RECORD a letter which, as a former member of the International Operations Subcommittee, I had addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee, the honorable gentleman from Virginia. This letter, dated December 29, 1956, set forth some of my serious reservations regarding the factual accuracy and interpretations of the subcommittee's report on United States aid operations in Iran. Regretting that my letter was not appended to the report as I had hoped it would be, I felt it should be made a matter of record before this House.

I now bring to the attention of the House, an additional document, which apparently through inadvertence, was omitted from the printed transcript of hearings before the subcommittee. This document consists of a summary of a statement given to the subcommittee in executive session by the Deputy Undersecretary of State, the Honorable Robert G. Murphy. This summary was prepared and provided to the subcommittee's staff last summer, after being cleared by the Department of State, in order to enable the transcript to include a public statement of the relevant facts surrounding this aid program.

I attach some importance to this since it provides what is nowhere else so succinctly presented, either in the report or in the transcript, that is, a description of the conditions which existed in Iran during the years 1951-54. To analyze the Iranian program without constant reference to these conditions is to analyze it in a vacuum. It was these conditions and the clear threat which they posed for Iran and the free world in general that set the tone of urgency and emergency which governed the conduct of United States aid operations in Iran during this fateful period. Our aid programs were deliberately planned to support the United States policy to assist Iran in regaining its stability, reestablishing security, protecting its independence and providing a basis for economic improvement. The immediate urgent problem in those years was to assist Iran in avoiding a Communist takeover by a subversive movement supported from abroad. Once this objective had been achieved, it was necessary to seek a solution to the long-deadlocked oil problem. Operating under such conditions, when time was perpetually of the essence and when American officials were frequently unable to move about the country or even from their homes to offices in safety, it was sometimes not possible to give the same leisurely, deliberate time to careful advance planning which is expected in more normal times. Further-

more, the overall success of the program is crystal clear. The measure of this success is that the objectives have been achieved.

The statement by Mr. Murphy sets forth the above facts and since this summary of his statement was prepared in order to make it available to the public, I believe it should be entered into the RECORD of this House.

Along the same line, I might refer briefly to an article which appeared in the February issue of the Reader's Digest. This article, entitled, "How Not To Handle Foreign Aid," written by a former ECA employee, appeared in print, by a curious coincidence, almost simultaneously with the publication of the subcommittee's report on the aid program in Iran. By the careful selection of certain information, most of which was provided to the subcommittee, this article manages to cast a cloud of suspicion over the objectives and management of the program in Iran. As my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], pointed out to the House on January 28, this article deals in personalities and for this reason should not be compared with the subcommittee's report. Nevertheless, there are a few points worth noting. The article describes the proposed Iranian Karaj Dam project solely as being a hydroelectric project and criticizes it on that ground, omitting any mention of the fact that it would actually be a multipurpose project which would provide power, drinking water to Teheran and irrigation water to the vicinity. The article indicates that the Iranians were bitterly opposed to the project and that it was forced on the country as the result of the alleged prejudices of one man, but neglects to mention that since before World War II, this project has been the dream of many Iranians desirous of raising their country's standard of living. The article quotes selectively from certain engineering reports and purports to demonstrate that all competent technical opinion is opposed to the project. No mention is made of the most recent engineering report by a well-known American firm retained by the Iranian 7-year plan organization. This report, on the basis of which, Iran is proceeding to get the project underway, finds that the dam will satisfy a great human need, provide additional annual revenues to the Government of Iran, increase irrigation and provide urgently needed water to Teheran as well as electric energy. While the article's author clearly favors thermal power over hydroelectric power, the most recent engineering studies state that in this case, an economic evaluation provides no clear-cut advantage to either thermal or hydroelectric power.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot provide the answers to these technical questions but I wanted to introduce this information solely with a view to introducing an element of moderate, calm perspective into what seems to me to have become a rather dangerously unbalanced and unobjective presentation of highly complex matters.

I feel that great credit should be given the representatives of the State Depart-

ment and the Foreign Operations Administration for the splendid manner in which our relationships with the Government of Iran was handled during this very difficult but tremendously important period. Any serious mistake or ineffectiveness on the part of our officials might have been disastrous, not only to us but to the free world, and I want to take advantage of this opportunity to compliment all of them in the performance of a highly satisfactory service, the long-range benefits of which we are unable to estimate.

#### SUMMARY OF STATEMENT OF DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY ROBERT MURPHY ON MAY 29, 1956

The Second World War made a terrific impact upon the political and economic life of Iran. Following the occupation of the country in 1941, Reza Shah, who had been ruling Iran with a firm hand for many years, abdicated and went into exile where he died. His son, Mohammed Shah, the present King, succeeded him. The Government of Iran was, for several years, in the difficult position of governing alongside allied military leaders who in performing their tasks were constantly making decisions which affected political and economic conditions in the country.

The departure of allied troops left the country in an unstable situation. Furthermore, the Russians left behind two puppet Communist regimes occupying most of northwestern Iran. They were driven out only in the winter of 1946. The central government was weak; the army was in a deplorable condition; Communists were active and at one time even succeeded in holding three cabinet posts in the government.

Eventually, early in 1950, a stronger central government under General Razamara was established and it looked as though more stable conditions were returning. In the spring of 1951, however, General Razamara was assassinated and a group of extreme nationalists, supported by a treacherous but energetic Communist element, came into power. One of the first actions of the new nationalist government under Dr. Mosadegh was to nationalize the oil industry and take control of the oil fields and the great Abadan refinery which had been operated by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. As a result, the export of Iranian oil came to a halt. Since the government was dependent to a large extent upon oil revenues to pay government salaries and meet other expenses, the absence of oil revenues had an immediate serious effect upon the financial and economic conditions of the country.

Unless some way could be found to revive the oil industry or unless the oil revenues could be replaced by funds from other sources, the Iranian Government was bound for bankruptcy, the national economy would become increasingly chaotic, and Iran would encounter increasing difficulties in maintaining its independence in the face of increased Communist pressures from her gigantic neighbor to the north.

Although Dr. Mosadegh, the Prime Minister, had no desire to see Iran fall under Soviet domination, he nevertheless took the position that in the circumstances he could not afford to complicate his situation by adopting a strong stand against international communism. A historic and bitter struggle gradually developed between the forces of freedom and international communism in Iran. It would have been contrary to the interests of Iran and of the free world for the country to fall under Communist domination and for the Persian Gulf to become a Communist lake. An Iran dominated by international communism would have been like a chunk of radio-active matter thrust



into the heart of the Middle East. Strategically, the downfall of Iran would have split the world, leaving the Communists free to push either west or east. The struggle which took place in Iran from 1951 to 1954 was sometimes of a most critical character. Cunningly, international communism remained in the background at first, pushing forward the more extreme leftwing which proceeded, step-by-step, to eliminate the influence of constructive Iranian nationalists.

In this struggle, the international communism had the advantage of proximity. For more than 1,200 miles, the borders of Iran touched on the Soviet Union. Along these borders were massed troops which from time to time would make demonstrations for the purpose of encouraging the relatively small but disciplined indigenous Communists and discouraging those who desired to maintain Iran's territorial and political integrity. International communism maintained well-organized and highly disciplined fifth columns in various parts of Iran. These fifth columns were trained for street fighting, and on occasion after occasion they were marshaled in the streets to demonstrate their strength and terrorize the population. Communists had penetrated most segments of Iranian life, official and nonofficial. The Soviet radio was used to blanket the country. International communism exerted every effort to exploit and mislead sincere Iranian nationalists.

By the spring of 1951 it had become clear that if Iran was to be saved from foreign domination, urgent assistance would have to be given. For a number of years there had been operating in Iran a military mission and a gendarmerie mission. Consideration was given to strengthening these missions and to sending more supplies to the Iranian defense and gendarmerie forces. Similarly, efforts were made to strengthening the MAAG mission which was devoted to the task of supplying weapons to the Iranian armed forces and training them in their use.

However, in view of the Iranian situation which was daily becoming more critical, more was needed than the mere furnishing of military support. Consideration, therefore, was given to sending to Iran a substantial Technical Cooperation Administration mission, the personnel of which would be distributed throughout various parts of the country and would render various types of technical assistance. With the passage of the MSA Act in October 1951, it was possible to bring these plans to fruition. Some \$23 million was allocated under the act for TCA assistance to Iran, and Mr. William C. Warne, who was at that time Assistant Secretary of the Interior, resigned and was appointed by President Truman to head the TCA mission. Mr. Warne consulted with Dr. Mosadegh while the latter was in the United States in November 1951 and the Iranian Prime Minister agreed, during the course of these conversations, to some of Mr. Warne's plans.

The means of strengthening Iran were not limited to military and technical assistance. Diplomatic and educational means also were used.

International communism did not fail to understand the dangers presented to their plans for Iran by strengthened and expanded American assistance. It made efforts to frustrate these activities. Pressure was put on Dr. Mosadegh to prevent him from coming to the agreements necessary for the extension of new aid programs. The Communist ridiculed and endeavored to undermine the TCA programs, claiming that no tangible aid was really planned and that these programs were being dangled before Iranian eyes merely to divert the Iranian Government from the path of nationalism. A distinction should be drawn between the real Iranian nationalists and the Communists. The real Iranian nationalists had no sympathy with Communist imperialism. They realized that the latter

represented a mortal danger to their country. But, as has happened elsewhere, the Communists cynically donned the cloak of nationalism to deceive the people and then proceeded with all haste to try to confuse and take over the nationalist movement.

The Communists used numerous devices in order to discredit American diplomacy and make it look like mere expressions of imperialism. They countered our public-relations work by increasing the number of anti-American programs on the radio and by heavy-handed pressure on important sections of the Iranian press. They belittled the Shah, who they knew would never acquiesce in their designs. They effected the removal from key military, police, and civilian positions of officials known to be strongly anti-Communist. They took energetic measures to make living in Iran hazardous for Americans. Communist-led gangs stoned American automobiles, terrorized Iranian citizens working for Americans, mud-plastered "Yankee, go home" slogans over countless walls. In Shiraz, Communist-inspired mobs actually attacked and destroyed TCA headquarters. During one period of violence, all Americans in Teheran were confined to their homes for 6 days. The successes of the Communist front were tempered by the fact that, despite these pressures, many Iranians who had had experience with Americans and who had seen the work being done by our military and technical-assistance personnel knew that the United States had no intention other than helping Iran to improve its conditions and preserve its independence.

The treatment accorded to American citizens during one period became so unbearable that it was necessary to stop recruitment for TCA (or FOA, as it later became). This halt in recruitment was extremely unfortunate, since it came about at a time when more personnel were needed to take care of the material and equipment coming into the country for use in certain assistance programs throughout Iran. In the summer of 1953 the situation had deteriorated so far that some American dependents found it necessary to depart. In one province adjacent to the U. S. S. R. it became necessary to remove all Americans. At the same time, it became increasingly difficult to recruit new TCA personnel for Iran. Such personnel as TCA was able to recruit preferred, as a rule, to go to areas where there would be greater security for their families.

In the field of diplomacy, the United States did its utmost to assist the parties to the oil dispute to come to some agreement which would permit a solution of the problem. Nevertheless, the Iranian Government broke relations with Great Britain, and the British Embassy was closed in the fall of 1952. This seriously complicated the problem, making it practically impossible to find any possible solution.

In March 1953, after a series of arduous and complicated negotiations between the Iranian Government and our Embassy, the purpose of which was to find a solution to the oil problem, the Mosadegh Government, under pressure from forces anxious to prevent a settlement, rejected proposals which were of a most reasonable nature. It began to become clear in the spring of that year that there did not exist conditions for an oil agreement of a kind which would result in a revival of the Iranian oil industry. It also became quite clear to Dr. Mosadegh that unless he could receive budgetary aid from the United States or some other foreign source, Iran, in the absence of an oil settlement, would quickly become bankrupt. He, therefore, endeavored to persuade the American Government to substitute budgetary aid for technical assistance. In June 1953 he sent a letter to President Eisenhower in which he intimated that if the United States could not give Iran budgetary aid at once

Iran might be compelled to turn elsewhere. This letter was correctly interpreted as a threat that Iran might turn toward the Soviet Union.

The President, in his reply, indicated that so long as Iran was not prepared to do its utmost to exploit its own natural resources, it could not expect budgetary aid from the United States. When this exchange of letters became public, a most serious crisis began to develop in Iran. It now became clear to the Shah, the Iranian military and civilian officials, and to the public that Iran was at a crossroads. If it was not to become an economic swamp it must either find a solution to the oil problem or resign itself to capitulating to the increasing pressures of international Communism.

In August 1953, the Shah issued a decree dismissing Dr. Mosadegh and appointing General Zahedi as Prime Minister in his stead. Mosadegh arrested two emissaries of the Shah who had requested his resignation. During the succeeding week, Iran began to slide rapidly in the direction of international communism. Communist-led mobs dominated the streets. They carried Communist slogans and sang Communist songs. Americans and other foreigners who ventured from their homes were attacked. Not only in Teheran, but in other prominent cities, slogans were displayed condemning the United States, praising the Soviet Union, and threatening the lives of American citizens.

Just at the moment when it seemed Iran might lose its independence, an uprising took place in Teheran and spread rapidly to other parts of the country. This spontaneous upsurge was in favor of the Shah and a free Iran, and against the forces which had brought Iran into such a perilous state. Within a period of 12 hours after this rioting had started, the tide had turned; General Zahedi took over as Prime Minister with the support of the Army, Gendarmerie, police, most civilian officials and the overwhelming majority of the people. There is every reason to believe that the aid given by the United States and the encouragement afforded by the steadfast friendship of the United States played an important role in helping Iran to survive during this dangerous period—1951-53. Fortunately for the Free World, international Communism had overplayed its hand. The Iranian people again demonstrated their determination to maintain the independence of their country.

General Zahedi, the new Prime Minister, established a Government which immediately indicated its desire to establish close friendly relations with the United States. This Government found itself in a difficult position. There were absolutely no funds left in the treasury. Mosadegh had for months been financing his government by the secret issuance of inflation-producing currency. One of the first acts of the new Prime Minister was to address a letter to President Eisenhower indicating that his Government was prepared to exploit the natural resources of Iran but that if it was to survive it must immediately have financial assistance. It was clear that if the United States failed to give budgetary aid at this critical time, the new Government could not survive. Therefore, financial assistance to the extent of \$45 million was granted as a first emergency measure to tide the Iranian Government over its immediate difficulties.

It was not easy for the new government to find an immediate solution of the oil problem. In spite of its goodwill and serious efforts, a little over a year elapsed before protracted and complicated negotiations culminated in the signing of an oil agreement in the late summer of 1954. Nearly 2 months more passed before the new agreement was ratified by both Houses of the Iranian Parliament. There was widespread concern in Iran lest the revenues from the revived oil industry would be drained away



uneconomically as had been the case in the past. The government, to dispel this uneasiness, indicated that in making use of oil revenues, priority would be given to economic development. It was the hope of the government at that time that these revenues, when plowed into the economy of the country, would produce a prosperity which in turn would result in increased tax receipts sufficient to enable the government to balance its budget. It will still take time for this hope to materialize.

The ratification of the oil agreement did not of itself solve Iran's financial problems. Several months of preparation were necessary before substantial quantities of oil could flow from the fields and the refinery at Abadan could begin to turn out oil products in large amounts. In the meantime, it was necessary for the Iranian Government to receive from some source, financial assistance to take care of its current budgetary deficit. The United States, therefore, has continued up to this time to give Iran budgetary aid.

In October 1951 there were probably not more than a score of Americans in Iran on the TCA payroll. In spite of the difficulties experienced in operating in the atmosphere prevailing in Iran prior to August 1953, the number of American personnel of TCA multiplied rapidly. In 1953, the Americans numbered more than 200 persons in addition to perhaps 1,500 Iranians.

In the fall of 1951, a table of organization was drawn up which provided for a well-staffed joint administrative service, serving both the Embassy and TCA. For various reasons, the personnel provided for in this table, failed to arrive in Iran. As a result, the enormous task of furnishing administrative support to the Embassy and TCA in all 10 provinces fell for a time on a handful of Americans and several hundred Iranians. Supplies came pouring in as also did American technical experts. It was impossible for the joint administrative service adequately to deal with the situation. Efforts were made to set up procedures for maintaining an inventory of property and a careful accounting of funds expended. These procedures too frequently broke down, however, under the stress and strain of the volume of work developed. In spite of administrative shortcoming, there was no abatement in the work of developing and carrying out technical assistance and economic programs. Slowing down of these programs would have tended to give credence to the charges which the enemies of the United States were making to the effect that it did not intend to give technical assistance and development aid to Iran. Furthermore, in view of the steadily worsening situation, it was considered imperative that as many American technicians as possible go to work throughout the country to demonstrate American interest in, and friendship for Iran and the American determination to help Iran during this trying period.

In view of this situation there unfortunately was some wastage of supplies and at times a certain amount of disorder in the handling and utilization of American equipment. Furthermore, some of the programs were undoubtedly not as carefully prepared as they would have been in a more normal situation. Partly, as a result of the chaotic conditions under which the work was being carried on, it was not until the summer of 1954 that it was possible to put into effect the kind of effective inventory and accounting procedures which the situation seemed to require. These procedures at the present time are fairly satisfactory although they are constantly being improved.

We believe that it was wise for TCA to push ahead rapidly with the programs even though there might be administrative shortcomings with regard to them. Events in Iran during the period 1951 to 1954 are evidence of the correctness of this policy.

#### AFL-CIO POLICY REGARDING FIFTH AMENDMENT

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the other body authorized—within 24 hours of the time it was proposed—a full-scale investigation of labor racketeering. I am sure that we here in this body wish them well. Although no Members of this body are to be included in this investigation, many of us have a keen interest in its field of inquiry. Mr. Meany and the leadership of the AFL-CIO are to be congratulated for their statesmanship in deciding to cooperate fully with Congress in this effort.

As one who has repeatedly called for a concerted attack on racketeering, I trust that what I have to say now will not be misunderstood. However, I feel compelled to comment on a particular part of the AFL-CIO's recent statement concerning racketeering investigations. I do so only because it concerns a fundamental constitutional right, the fifth amendment's protection of the privilege against self-incrimination.

As it appears in the New York Times of Tuesday, January 24, 1957, the AFL-CIO statement announces the following policy:

If a trade union official decides to invoke the fifth amendment for his personal protection and to avoid scrutiny by proper legislative committees, law enforcement agencies, or other public bodies into corruption on his part, he has no right to continue to hold office in his union.

If this statement means what it seems to mean; namely, that any union official who avails himself of his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination will be, ipso facto, automatically dismissed without a hearing, then we should all be disturbed. For this would not be due process of law. And in a great organization such as the AFL-CIO, which is in a sense clothed with the public interest, it seems to me especially important that due process be followed.

Less than a year ago the United States Supreme Court, in the Slochower case, passed on this same basic issue. Slochower had been dropped from his teaching position at Brooklyn College solely because he had invoked the fifth amendment under questioning by a congressional committee. The Supreme Court held that his summary dismissal violated due process of law.

In its decision the Court said:

At the outset we must condemn the practice of imputing a sinister meaning to the exercise of a person's constitutional right under the fifth amendment. The right of an accused person to refuse to testify, which had been in England merely a rule of evidence, was so important to our forefathers that they raised it to the dignity of a constitutional enactment, and it has been recognized as one of the most valuable prerogatives of the citizen. *Brown v. Walker* (161 U. S. 591, 610). We have reaffirmed our faith in this principle recently in *Quinn v. United States* (349 U. S. 155). In *Ullmann v. United States*, decided last month, we scored the assumption that those who claim this privilege are either criminals or perjurers. The privilege against self-incrimination would be reduced to a hollow mockery if its exer-

cise could be taken as equivalent either to a confession of guilt or a conclusive presumption of perjury. As we pointed out in *Ullmann*, a witness may have a reasonable fear of prosecution and yet be innocent of any wrongdoing. The privilege serves to protect the innocent who otherwise might be ensnared by ambiguous circumstances. (See Griswold, *The Fifth Amendment Today* (1955).)

If, as James P. Carey has suggested, the AFL-CIO were to make its own investigation of a case following a union official's use of the fifth amendment, it might then properly decide that legitimate grounds existed for expelling the official in question. However, this is a very different thing from automatically expelling every official who avails himself of his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination.

The AFL-CIO deserves the fullest praise for its determination to cooperate with Congress in a joint effort to attack labor racketeering. But need we undermine, in pursuing this laudable objective, what is, and should remain, a cherished constitutional right?

#### DROUGHT LEGISLATION

(Mr. ROGERS of Texas asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was terribly saddened by the announcement made by Mr. COOLEY that we could not vote on the drought legislation today; sad, not only because we will not consider this legislation today, but saddened further because it looks like the Congress of the United States has now abdicated to the executive branch of the Government. Many of us who are familiar with the drought problems in this great Southwest country worked on this legislation, yet we come here and get ready to decide on the legislation, as representatives of the people, and one man walks in from the executive branch of the Government and says, "No, representatives of the people, you do not have any right to consider this because I am opposed to it and I want to study it."

I want to say to Mr. Benson that this is no time for delay. The people who would be helped by this bill, need the assistance now, and cannot wait for the Secretary to study it at his leisure.

There is one other thing I want to say. Many people in this Congress studied this bill, people who knew and understood the drought situation and the farm problem a great deal better than Mr. Benson does. I do not think his experts down there are qualified to veto what the people, who are sent to Congress, decide upon. It is indeed a sad day when one man can control the destinies of so many in this country.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to understand all this cry about postponing legislation on this drought situation. It has been only 4 or 5 days since gentlemen gave the President authority to declare war, use our



men wherever he wanted to, put them under the command of the United Nations—not under the Stars and Stripes, but under the United Nations.

Now, why squawk about this slight delay? Now they are crying about it. But just a few days ago absolute authority was given the President to make and carry on war. Is the present situation more important than the Nation's future?

The President went out of his way to kill a good news story, when he said the Secretary of Defense made an unwise remark, and then when Mrs. Wilson took him to task, and rightly I think, invited Wilson and Mrs. Wilson to hitchhike with him down to Florida. What becomes of that nice little difference of opinion which the press might have used for 2 or 3 days on the front page? It is all gone into thin air. Just another example of the way people in a free country operate.

(Mr. FISHER asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern expressed by my colleagues in regard to the postponement of action on the bill that has been discussed this morning.

This bill relates to the terrible drought situation which the Weather Bureau and all authorities on this subject say is the worst in more than 300 years in a considerable area of the United States. It covers more than 600 counties, about one-fifth of all the counties in the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to say to the gentleman and to the House that this is merely a postponement of this important matter. I wanted to fix the responsibility for the postponement, and it is fixed now on Mr. Ezra Benson and Mr. True D. Morse of the Department of Agriculture.

Our committee acted expeditiously on this bill. The bill was well and thoroughly considered and again I repeat was unanimously reported. Officials of the Department of Agriculture had an opportunity to be heard at the time hearings were being held. The passage of the bill should not be delayed, and I assure you that its presentation to the House will not long be delayed.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think we all recognize that it is not an objection to the bill but a request for a postponement. I feel confident it will be taken up and passed in a reasonable time. Secretary Benson was in Texas and other drought-stricken States with President Eisenhower. He showed his solicitude for the plight of the drought victims. He has been most understanding of our problems in the past and I am confident that upon study of this treatment of the land as a relief and restoration measure, he will approve this very sound and helpful proposal. I have talked with people in the Soil Conservation Service, and I think

I know their attitude. We have a most desperate problem to deal with and I am certain Secretary Benson recognizes that to be true. This deferred grazing proposal is sound, practicable, and badly needed. It will more than pay for itself in restoring the land to productive capacity much more rapidly than would otherwise be the case. It will pay the Government dividends because it will speed up the restoration of the economy of a vast area. That will mean more taxes, more income, more stability.

#### OFFICIAL OBJECTORS ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House the appointment on the Democratic side of the official objectors committee on the Consent Calendar: The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. ASPINALL; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND; and the gentleman from California, Mr. McFALL.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to announce the appointment on the Republican side of members on the official objectors committee on the Consent Calendar: The gentleman from Iowa, Mr. CUNNINGHAM; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. BYRNES; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORD; and the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. WEAVER.

#### OFFICIAL OBJECTORS ON THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. I also wish to announce that the following Members have been appointed to the objectors committee on the Private Calendar: The gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ROBERTS; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND; and the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to announce the appointment on the Republican side of members on the objectors committee on the Private Calendar: The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SHEEHAN; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. VAN PELT; and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. AVERY.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as we know, service on these committees is very important. They render exceedingly valuable service to the House and to the people of the country, and it is done by these Members at great sacrifice. I want to express my sincere thanks to the Members who served during the last Congress for serving again this Congress, and to the new Members, the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] my thanks for being willing to serve on these committees which require so much extra work.

#### AVIATION MEDICAL RESEARCH

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for aviation medical research and to broaden the medical responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The bill would set up the Office of Civil Aviation Medicine within the CAA to develop essential technical information in the field of aviation medicine and medical fitness standards for pilots and other airmen.

The legislation calls for the creation and equipment of a Civil Aeronautics medical research laboratory to provide a counterpart in medicine to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. In the field of civil aviation this would provide the equivalent of the medical reach and development facilities of the Armed Forces for the development of technical medical information essential to aviation safety.

The Office of Civil Aviation Medicine in the CAA would be headed by a civil-air surgeon. The civil-air surgeon would establish minimum human requirements in aircraft design, minimum standards of mental and physical fitness for civil airmen, promulgate regulations for inspection of aircraft with respect to human requirements, conduct and encourage research and investigation in aviation medicine, be required to investigate medical causes of accidents and where needed require physical examination of passengers and crew members involved in accidents.

The civil-air surgeon also would be authorized to make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals and to other public and private institutions and to individuals for research projects recommended by a Federal Advisory Council on Civil Aviation Medicine also set up under the terms of the bill. The bill appropriates \$2,500,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Medical Research Laboratory to carry out the provisions of the measure.

#### THE DROUGHT SITUATION

(Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the people in the drought area is very bad and I am very sympathetic to them; I really think something should be done about it, but I assumed that after the President and the Secretary flew over the drought area that everything was taken care of.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I remember, about 2 years ago, Mr. Benson was out in this same area. In one town he blamed the drought on the Democrats, but at another stop he urged the people to pray for rain. I suppose it would be expecting too much to ask some consistency from the Secretary of Agriculture.



Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman; but he is asking too much when he asks Mr. Benson to be consistent except consistently against the farmer.

#### IMPORTATION OF TEXTILES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution requesting the House Committee on Ways and Means to investigate and study the arrangement recently negotiated with Japan by the State Department and others under which Japan will limit her exports of cotton textiles to this country over a 5-year period.

Mr. Speaker, in asking this investigation and study I wish to make it clear that I do not oppose the limitation of imports of cotton textiles. I believe that such limitation was and is necessary. I approve of the limitation but not of the method of securing it. The cotton textile industry was being seriously injured in several lines of cotton goods by imports from Japan.

Strenuous efforts were made by the industry through their representatives in the Congress for a period of more than a year to obtain relief. Every effort was strongly opposed by the executive branch of the Government. Not only that, but in a trade agreement with Japan the duty on textiles was sharply reduced. Announcement of this reduction was not made until after the bill continuing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed.

It became clear in a short time that the duty should not have been reduced in the first place. Such reductions were opposed before the Committee for Reciprocity Information no less than before the Tariff Commission in hearings held for the guidance of the State Department prior to the actual negotiations. It now appears that such hearings are little better than a matter of form. Once in Geneva the United States delegates seem to pay not the least attention to the statements made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information by representatives of the industry and their workers.

Mr. Speaker, that is a super-duper committee set up to permit the Executive to get some alleged facts on which to override findings of the Tariff Commission. Of course, you know that the Tariff Commission is an arm of the Congress. Yet they have set up this committee to override the findings of the Tariff Commission and give the President some alleged ground at least for so doing. The textile industry made a showing before that super-duper committee.

What would happen if the duty were to be reduced was clear enough. There could be no question about the advantage held by Japan in competition with our own mills. Already imports were coming in at an alarming rate. But, of course, the State Department had its policy to carry out. The policy of freer trade through more liberal imports must

be served. Nothing else mattered. Hold hearings, yes; but pay no attention to them.

Well, we know what happened. The American textile industry was like a row of sitting ducks under the guns of Japanese competition. The low Japanese wages, combined with modern textile machinery in Japanese plants, gave Japan a cost advantage that was a sure key to our market for the cheaper varieties of goods. The cost advantage was made wider by the cotton disposal program of the Department of Agriculture which enables Japanese mills to purchase raw cotton at a price lower than domestic mills had to pay.

When the tide of imports rolled in there was no stopping them. In a short time the imports succeeded in taking large and growing slices of the whole market for velveteens, gingham, damasks, blouses, and other lines.

The industry undertook to invoke the existing administrative remedies such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Escape Clause of the Trade Agreements Act. The action under section 22 was strenuously opposed by the administration, and it came to naught.

I recall that more than 100 representatives from the textile area, both from the Senate and the House, made appointments with President Eisenhower personally and urged him to take some action to protect the industry under this section 22. But he failed and refused to do it on the objection of the State Department. Action under the Escape Clause was delayed by an overall approach that failed to distinguish between different classes of cotton goods. The Tariff Commission pointed to the need of examining the imports of particular items.

Several applications were then filed by the industry, covering individual items such as velveteens, gingham, pillow cases, blouses, and so forth.

It was at this point that the devious strategy that culminated in the recently announced self-limitation of exports by Japan began to take shape.

Now I call your attention to the fact that the President and the Department of State urged the textile industry to do this very thing, to pursue its remedies before the Tariff Commission. They did that. They accepted the recommendation of the President and the Department of State, and they did everything they could to make those remedies available.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is the gentleman aware of any report as yet made by the textile industry, a report on the recent agreement reached between the Japanese Government and our Government on this very question?

Mr. LANHAM. No; I do not know of any report, and I know of no report from the State Department. It is sort of a secret matter. That is what we want to find out by this resolution.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I agree with the gentleman, but here is what I am

getting at. Has the gentleman as yet had a report from the textile industry as to what the real effect of that decision will be on our textile industry?

Mr. LANHAM. No; I have not.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. We are both looking for that report, I am sure.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. We would like to have that report, and one from the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We do have information, however, that the Japanese may or may not go through with the agreement recently set up. They seem to be, if I understand the situation correctly, insisting that if they go through with this agreement, that the United States Government bring pressure upon—what States are they—South Carolina and Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Georgia and several others, to withdraw their laws or to repeal their laws on the labeling of textiles imported from Japan.

Mr. GROSS. That seems to be entering into the picture now; that the United States bring pressure to bear upon them.

Mr. LANHAM. I have introduced this resolution, and I want to know if the State Department promised to nullify these laws if they were passed. Now, I do not say that I think this will do much good, but we want to know the facts.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I have been unofficially informed that the State Department has not only agreed to set aside most of the regulations that apply to other nations, but they have agreed with the Japanese that they will not enforce the sections of the escape clause; in other words, they would prohibit the textile industry from going before the Tariff Commission for a period.

Mr. LANHAM. And after they go, the President ignores the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BAILEY. I know, but they are going so far as to try to bind the Congress and the Tariff Commission in not conducting any hearings to determine injury within the industry.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you not think, then, that the Committee on Ways and Means should find out for us just exactly what they did promise?

Mr. BAILEY. Just what is in the agreement.

Mr. LANHAM. And whether there is an agreement or not, I think it is an arrangement. I do not think it is even an agreement.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. With respect to these Japanese agreements, it was quite generous of the Japanese Government to agree to permit our textile industry to continue, because the State Department had become determined not to let them continue. That was true in my State. So, the only thing we had left to do was



tent of the law and to go all the way to rescue its citizenry. More can yet be done and it must be done.

Mr. Speaker, in this area of Kentucky we have had more than our share of floods in the past, but this one has broken all records. For example, on the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy at Kermit, W. Va., the stage read 44.8 feet. This was 6 feet higher than the previous record of 38.8 in 1918. The stage of the Levisa Fork at Pikeville, Ky., was in excess of 52 feet, equal to or breaking the record set 95 years ago. Record-breaking floods were recorded all through the Hazard, Ky., area, and in Letcher County on both the north fork and the middle fork of the Kentucky River.

It was 20 years ago this January past that this country was shocked by the disastrous floods in the Ohio River valley. The Flood Control Act following approved a general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin. This plan recommended construction of 3 reservoirs in the Big Sandy Basin and 3 in the Kentucky River Basin. Of the authorized reservoirs, only one—Dewey—on the Levisa fork of the Big Sandy, has been constructed and is effective in the control of floods. In the meantime, the need for these reservoirs has greatly increased.

In spite of the disappointment due to construction delays, I feel there is hope in the studies now being made by the Corps of Engineers. The Big Sandy survey report is due by June 30 of this year, and the Kentucky River by June 30, 1958. A comprehensive survey on the Big Sandy and Kentucky Rivers will reappraise the need for upstream reservoirs as well as needed navigation, as well as the need for floodwalls or other local protection works that might be desirable, in view of the unprecedented floods.

It is my information from the Corps of Engineers that reservoirs on both the Kentucky and Big Sandy may retain water for domestic and industrial uses, with pollution measures to be considered.

These factors all merit restudy in the light of present-day conditions. Located close to large coal reserves and a surplus of labor, full employment of the potentialities of the region could be realized.

But, getting back to today's disaster, I know there is some difficulty in preparing for floods such as these. The only remedy to prevent their recurrence is the construction of reservoirs under the national flood-control program.

Mr. Speaker, upon receipt of word from the Courier-Journal's Ben Reeves about the Neon flood last Tuesday morning, January 29, and in view of subsequent developments, this date is of especial significance. Immediately, I realized that a far-reaching disaster was on hand. I talked to Neon, Ky., promptly. Immediately, my office alerted the National Civil Defense at Battle Creek, Mich., and the regional Director of Civil Defense at Olney, Md. Immediately, I personally alerted the State civil defense at Louisville, Ky., and immediately, the National Red Cross was alerted by my office and they promptly contacted their local offices in eastern Kentucky and

dispatched trained disaster workers to the area. None of these agencies had received prior notice of this disaster, and all have worked effectively, but much remains to be done. However, flood-prevention measures to prevent the recurrence of such disasters can be initiated by Congress only. That is our task and our duty.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include some newspaper articles.)

#### RELIEF FOR DROUGHT AREAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much disappointed today when I learned that an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture had, to use the phrase that we sometimes hear, thrown a monkey wrench into the works as far as drought relief is concerned at the present time.

I happen to live out in that area myself, and I know what things are like. We have had five consecutive droughts in the area, and it has now extended into western Illinois and southern Iowa, and, of course, extends from the gulf coast of Texas almost to the Canadian border. There may be a little of North Dakota that has had rain. I think perhaps in the northwest corner of the State they have had normal rainfall. Most of that territory has had in 5 years only 3 normal years of rainfall. But the exodus from the farm is not due to the drought, because it is going on all over the United States. In the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, 600,000 farm families left the farms in the United States. My home State of Missouri contributed 28,431 farm families to that exodus. There are 8 counties in my congressional district, and the farm families that gave up their farms in those 8 counties ran from 106 in LaFayette County to 616 in Jackson County. So I know what the drought, coupled with one Ezra Taft Benson, is doing to the farmers in my home State. That is happening all over the United States.

I have a little article here that I would like to read to my colleagues. It was written by N. F. O., reporter.

[From the Henry County Democrat of January 11, 1957]

#### COMMENT AND OPINION

(By the Editor)

#### AS I AM LEAVING THE FARM

Now the crowd has gone and you have loaded the last reluctant cow and stubborn hog out to their various destinations. As the last truckload pulls out of the strangely silent barn, you stand and smoke thoughtfully.

Bill, your neighbor and best friend, comes and leans up beside you. Bill has helped with the sale all day and now he stands hunched against the raw wind cold of the December evening.

You stand there together, awkwardly trying to make conversation but soon each of you quit trying to put your thoughts into words and just stand. After a bit, he pulls his coat collar up a little higher, bids a gruff "So long" and strides off into the dark.

You turn the yard light on. You feel that somehow it will make the silent barn and

empty lots less lonely. You make the rounds closing the open doors and widely flung gates. Why? Nothing left to get out, but habit is strong.

Somehow, you dread going into the house; the kids, not too long home from school, will be noisily asking questions about the sale; questions you don't care to answer.

The whole family will be discussing the move to town; a step you hate to think about. You pull your collar a little higher around your ears and hunker down on the lee side of the barn, out of the gusty wind—to think.

A confused jumble of thoughts run through your head. "Where did I fail? Surely not from lack of hard work." You think of the backbreaking years of toil you and your wife have spent. Lack of management? Maybe you could have managed better, but you were always counted a good farmer.

You loved the soil and tended it carefully, your terraced fields and neat farmstead will vouch for that. Your mouth twists bitterly as you contemplate the fate of those fields. The man farming your land next year has merely added your little 160 to his already extensive holdings and a vision of your farmstead, deserted and weedgrown, flits through your mind.

The new operator is also a firm believer in straight rows; you sadly contemplate the fate of your terraced fields and grassed waterways. Oh well, maybe all small farms have to go; that seems to be the trend now, anyway.

On that move to town? What in the devil are you going to do in town? You can slop hogs and milk cows but folks in town don't seem to have any demand for those skills. Also you have come to realize that you are a heck of a lot older than you thought you were. Seems like 45 is 10 years too old to be worth a darn for anything as far as getting a job is concerned.

You think of the future with a deep aching fear. You can't help it. "What if I can't find a job? What will my wife and family do if I can't? How will the kids adjust themselves to town life?"

As you sit there pondering, old Shep comes up, sits down by you and lays his head on your knee. Poor old dog. This has been a day of bewildering events as far as he's concerned.

Now he whines softly and thumps his tail on the ground, seeking the reassurance that his upside-down world will be righted again. You absently pat his head and there you sit together—in a way, two of a kind, for you have a feeling that old Shep, more than anyone else in the world, really knows how you feel.

Now the question that you have postponed answering several times in the last few weeks demands a final answer. "What's to become of old Shep?" You've had Shep since puppyhood but now he's old, lame and half blind. None of the neighbors want him and there is no place for dogs where you are going, so your question has but one answer. You know that answer—and a sudden moisture stings your eyes that you can't blame on the bitter wind.

You look across the driveway to the crib. In the glare of the yard light, the different-colored sale bills tacked up there today, stand out strangely.

There they hang an even dozen of them, stuck up there by fellow farmers, each one bearing that pathetic heading "As I Am Leaving the Farm." You gaze at those brightly colored scraps of cardboard. Some of the names on them are men you know, men like yourself, being torn from the soil they loved and have cherished, to be thrown into a strange and unfriendly environment.

Men whose dreams and hopes withered with their crops the last two drought-stricken years and now, like you, will be walking city pavements when the bluegrass greens the hills next spring.



You can't help but wonder about the bright boys; those boys' heads are full of statistics rather than brains; whose answer to the farm problem is "Get rid of the small inefficient farmer." You wonder how they'd feel if they were in your shoes.

You're getting cold so you start slowly toward the house. Under the yard light pole lays one of your sale bills. Your own name in big letters at the bottom looks strange. You walk up to it and idly turn it with your foot. A gust of wind catches it and away it goes, across the driveway into the road, to disappear in a cloud of dust—into the cold windy dark.—The N. F. O. Reporter.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 56, 85th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House: Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, chairman; Mr. EWINS, of Tennessee; Mr. MULTER, of New York; Mr. YATES, of Illinois; Mr. STEED, of Oklahoma; Mr. ROOSEVELT, of California; Mr. BROWN, of Missouri; Mr. HILL, of Colorado; Mr. RIEHLMAN, of New York; Mr. SEELY-BROWN, of Connecticut; Mr. McCULLOCH, of Ohio; Mr. SHEEHAN, of Illinois; and Mr. HOSMER, of California.

#### WONDERFUL SPEECH BY MAJORITY LEADER IN SENATE, HON. LYNDON JOHNSON, ON DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF HIGH INTEREST

(Mr. PATMAN, at the request of Mr. MILLS, was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a short speech made by the majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, on the floor of the Senate last Friday on the devastating effects of high interest and, particularly, its effect on small business. It is as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the cause of this disturbing trend in failures is not altogether clear. But certain things are readily apparent.

The tight money policy hits the small-business man much harder than it hits the big fellow.

The continual trend toward mergers of big companies leave a smaller share of the market for the average businessman.

Rising costs all along the line add to the difficulties of a small firm in meeting expenses.

And, of those increasing costs, one of the most important is the increasing cost of money. This is something that is felt all along the line—by business, by government, and by the average citizen.

Mr. President, I am told that if the interest rates applicable to the Federal debt in 1952 had held at those lower levels, and been applicable to the 1956 debt, our taxpayers would have been saved approximately \$717 million.

We must also realize that the problems of financing are complicated in every field as the cost of money constantly rises. Because of the constant rise in interest rates, municipalities are assuming excessively heavy interest obligations in order to sell their bonds.

Mr. President, this is a situation that can change our whole economy. The rising cost

of money and other necessities represents a constant squeeze on small business—and the squeeze will eliminate many as time goes on.

I have never been opposed to big business as such, as it plays a vital role in our whole economy. But we face the problem of maintaining the free-enterprise system, and that is something we cannot do unless we help small business remain vital and flourishing.

This is a problem which must be tackled from many standpoints. The Congress has the committees. They are ably led and I think ably manned with most efficient staffs. I believe they can, and I hope they will, during this session face up to this challenge and do the job as it ought to be done.

Although I agree with everything Senator JOHNSON said, I will comment on the statement he made to the effect that the increasing cost of money is felt all along the line. Before doing so, I would like to state:

First. In any fight against inflation, if it is necessary to increase interest rates, and there is not a better alternative, I will favor such an increase to stop inflation; however, I am not willing to concede that a normal, necessary expansion in our economy is inflation. Neither am I willing to say that there is ruinous inflation facing us when small business, the farmer, and the home-building industry are suffering as they are today.

Second. To increase interest rates, which increases the cost of doing business all along the line, is itself inflationary and is, for all practical purposes, like trying to put out a fire by pouring gasoline on it. Interest rates have been going up rapidly the past 2 years, so have prices. If higher interest will stop price increases why has it not worked the last 2 years?

Third. For approximately 14 years, Government bonds did not sell below par, being protected by the open market committee of the Federal Reserve System. This gave stability to the bond market and assured every person, who bought bonds, that he could always get his money back. In recent years, the bond market has been permitted to drop as low as 87 cents on the dollar, which is a national disgrace and a great reflection on the Congress, Congress having entrusted the matter to an agency that has allowed such an awful thing to happen. The Government bond market could have been supported without cost to the Government or to the Federal Reserve banks.

Fourth. The total debts of the country aggregate over seven hundred billion dollars, including the national debt. A 1 percent increase on our debt means a rate of increase equivalent to a \$40-a-year increase on every man, woman, and child in America, or at the rate of an extra cost of \$200 a year for a family of five. If this is not paid directly, it is paid indirectly because increasing interest is a hidden tax.

#### INCREASED INTEREST UNBALANCES ALL BUDGETS

Now more about what Senator JOHNSON said.

A small increase in the Federal Reserve discount rate unbalances every budget in America from the national budget down to the smallest budget in the home of one of the lowest income.

The discount rate has increased 200 percent the last 2 years. It sets the pace for the price of money; is the lowest wholesale interest rate. An increase of one-fourth of 1 percent in the discount rate means an increase of many times that amount in the money market—effective immediately.

The discount rate is almost wholly psychological. It is intended to be the rate charged a member bank for money the member bank gets from the Federal Reserve bank. If banks do not borrow any funds, the rate is still applicable in the money market. The rate is used very little because the amount of funds obtained by member banks from the Federal Reserve banks is surprisingly small; banks have other ways of obtaining this reserve money—the powerful dollars, upon which they can expand an average of 6 to 1; in other words, lend \$6 to every \$1 the banks have in reserve. So a raise in the discount rate is a deliberate act to unbalance all budgets in America by giving a great advantage and special privilege to lenders of money and credit.

Let us see how an increase in interest rates affects the entire country and every living person.

The Federal Government must pay more money on its debts. By reason of increases the past 4 years in interest, the Federal Government is required to pay almost a billion dollars a year more for interest on the national debt. This must be paid in taxes and becomes an increased burden on all taxpaying citizens.

All States, counties, cities, and political subdivisions, such as road districts, school districts, levee districts, and many other districts of all kinds of purposes to serve and accommodate the people must pay more for new funds.

The people in each State and in each city will feel the increase in interest rates by having to pay more in taxes very soon after such an increase and the other subdivisions when they borrow more funds.

Every public service corporation, including gas, water, telephone, electricity, transportation, and sewer, will have to pay more interest, which will require higher rates to the public and which will be paid by the users of the service; it will show up on their bills.

Every manufacturing concern will have to pay more interest, which will be added to the cost of the goods produced; each handler and transporter of the goods will not only add an additional amount to the extra interest added by the manufacturer, but will add the increased interest that they are also compelled to pay.

These interest increases are added on everything that is bought by the consumers—and that includes us all.

#### FARMER HIT HARDEST

The farmer is hit the hardest on what he buys on increased interest because all of the increase is passed right on to him. For instance, the farmer buys a tractor. From the time the iron ore is taken from the earth and transported on the barge and the railroad to the blast furnace and made into pig iron, to the steel mill, the fabricator, the manufacturer of tractors,







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Feb. 6, 1957  
For actions of Feb. 5, 1957  
85th - 1st, No. 21

### CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1	Grazing.....2	Reclamation.....35
Automation.....25	Housing.....3,6	Recreation.....29
Budget.....13,38	Land jurisdiction.....9	Small business.....26
Civil defense.....28	Loans, housing.....3	Social security.....33
Conservation.....40	farm.....18,34	Soil conservation.....22
Corn.....12	Manpower.....8	Surplus disposal.....15
Drought relief.....2,22	Monopolies.....7	Taxation.....10,32
Electrification.....20	Natural resources.....5	Trade, foreign.....4,31
Expenditures.....23	Newsprint.....21	Transportation.....4,10
Farm program.....16	Personnel.....8,23,29	Veterans benefits.....3
Flood insurance.....36	Poultry inspection...17,30	Water utilization.....14
Food additives.....37	Property.....39	Wheat.....27
Forestry.....11,19,24		

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed urgent deficiency appropriation bill. House Rules Committee cleared deferred grazing bill for debate today. Rep. Poage announced resignation from Secretary's special drought committee. Rep. Jensen explained provisions of his bill to amend corn acreage allotments. Rep. Anfuso spoke in favor of poultry inspection.

### HOUSE

1. URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1957. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 4249. No change was made in the USDA items (see Digest 19). pp.1361-88
2. DROUGHT RELIEF. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 2367, to establish a deferred grazing program for drought stricken areas (p. 1404). The bill is to be debated today (pp. 1386, D71).  
Rep. Poage announced his resignation from the Secretary's special drought committee and inserted his letter of resignation to the Secretary criticizing the position of this Department on drought relief legislation (p. 1367).
3. VETERANS' AFFAIRS. Agreed to with amendment H. Res. 64, authorizing investigations of veterans' benefits by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, including housing loans. p. 1388
4. FOREIGN TRADE. Agreed to with amendment H. Res. 99, authorizing investigations by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, including transportation. pp. 1389-91
5. NATURAL RESOURCES. Agreed to as reported H. Res. 94, authorizing investigations



by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of matters within its jurisdiction. pp. 1391-2

6. HOUSING. Agreed to with amendment H. Res. 86, authorizing an investigation of housing by the Banking and Currency Committee. pp. 1392-3
7. MONOPOLIES. Agreed to with amendment H. Res. 107, authorizing investigations by the Judiciary Committee, including antitrust laws. pp. 1393-4
8. PERSONNEL. Rep. Davis praised the work of his subcommittee in the investigation of manpower utilization and personnel management matters, and urged that the work of the subcommittee be continued. pp. 1400-01
9. LAND JURISDICTION. Received from the Attorney General part I of the report of the interdepartmental committee for the study of jurisdiction over Federal areas within the States; to Government Operations Committee. p. 1404
10. TRANSPORTATION. Received an Idaho Legislature resolution favoring repeal of the transportation tax. p. 1407
11. FORESTRY. Received an Oreg. Legislature resolution favoring extension of the time for termination of the Klamath Indian Reservation. p. 1407

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. CORN. Extension of remarks of Rep. Jensen explaining his bill, H. R. 4108, which provides a minimum base of 51 million acres for corn allotted on the basis of tillable acreage, 90% supports on the first 4,000 bushels, 20% of allotted land in the soil bank, and allows non-complying farmers to use the conservation reserve. pp. A754-5
13. BUDGET. Rep. Natcher inserted an editorial contending that our present spending will benefit future generations, not merely burden them. p. A758  
Extension of remarks of Rep. Wright urging passage of his bills, including one providing for budgeting on an annual-cost, accrued expenditure, basis, as the Hoover Commission recommended. pp. A769-70
14. WATER UTILIZATION. Rep. Younger inserted a speech by Calif. Assemblyman Wineburger, in which Federal control of water in the States was attacked, as destructive of State grants of water rights. pp. A765-7
15. SURPLUS DISPOSAL. Rep. Bray inserted the resolutions of the Indiana Council of Churches, which commended the Government's making agricultural surpluses available for use through voluntary agencies. p. A771
16. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Jensen inserted a suggested plan of study of the farm problem, and a suggested Agriculture Commission to do the studying. pp. A771-2
17. POULTRY INSPECTION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Anfuso favoring mandatory poultry inspection in the Meat Inspection Branch. p. A772
18. FARM LOANS. Rep. Knutson inserted an article on the rising interest rates for farm loans in her Minn. district. p. A773
19. FORESTRY. Rep. Shuford inserted an article on the life of the late James McClure, past president of the American Forestry Association. pp. A778-9

## CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 2367

---

FEBRUARY 5, 1957.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 147]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 147, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.







## House Calendar No. 12

85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 147

[Report No. 28]

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 5, 1957

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

## RESOLUTION

1       *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it  
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into  
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the  
4 Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2367) to  
5 establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed  
6 program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken  
7 areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for  
8 other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are  
9 hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be con-  
10 fined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be

1 equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking  
2 minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill  
3 shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At  
4 the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amend-  
5 ment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the  
6 House with such amendments as may have been adopted,  
7 and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on  
8 the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without  
9 intervening motion except one motion to recommit.





85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 147

[Report No. 28]

---

## RESOLUTION

---

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 2367, a bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia

---

FEBRUARY 5, 1957

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be  
printed

[Mr. POAGE], a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, some years ago the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit to ask certain Members of the Congress to serve on what was known as an advisory group, or as consultants to the special drought committee of the Department of Agriculture. I happen to have been named as one of the members along with one of our colleagues and 2 members from the other body.

For a time we had a few meetings with representatives of the Department. Those meetings never seemed to accomplish anything because our advice, as far as I could see, was never taken. It is true that those meetings did allow the Department to suggest from time to time: "Well, we have discussed this policy with representatives of the Congress, so our policy must be their policy."

For approximately 18 months no meetings have been held, but as late as last week the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and made substantially this statement: "I may say also that there are 4 Members of Congress who have been named as consultants to the committee, and they have on occasion met with us, Senator ANDERSON, Senator SCHOEPPPEL, from your own body, and 2 Members of the House of Representatives. We try to consult with them even when they do not meet with the committee."

I want to make it plain that there has been no effort brought to my attention on the part of the Department of Agriculture to consult with at least this 1 of the 4 consultants for 18 long months. For that reason I have felt that these consultants could serve no possible purpose other than as a means to allow the Department to place blame on the consultants rather than to accept blame for an erroneous decision itself.

Therefore on yesterday I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture which I think I should read to the Members of the House because it bears upon the action of this House. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., February 4, 1957.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,

Secretary of Agriculture,

Department of Agriculture,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: Some 2 or 3 years ago I was advised that I had been named as 1 of 4 congressional advisers to your departmental drought advisory committee. Shortly after our appointment the advisers had several meetings with representatives of your Department. These meetings gradually became fewer. I believe the last was held about 18 months ago. Nobody in the Department has asked for my advice since then. My advice was not taken even when the meetings were held. I had supposed that you had considered that our tenure as advisers had ceased to exist. I was, therefore, somewhat surprised to learn that in your appearance before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last week you are reported to have stated:

"May I say also that there are four Members of the Congress that had been named as consultants to the committee, and they have, on occasion, met with us: Senator ANDERSON, Senator SCHOEPPPEL from your own

body, and two Members of the House of Representatives. We try to consult with them even when they do not meet with the committee."

Apparently you made the positive statement that you try to consult with these congressional advisers, although no such consultation has taken place with me for approximately a year and a half. I think that your statements are calculated to give the impression that the named Members of Congress exercised some influence in shaping the drought policy.

The Agriculture Committee of the House has made a serious and conscientious effort to deal with at least a phase of the drought program. A large number of bills were introduced something like 4 weeks ago on this subject. The committee on January 17 requested that your Department give it the benefit of the Department's views. Up until this morning we had not received any such memorandum of views. In the meantime, we held rather extended hearings. We invited the Department to send any individual they felt best qualified to speak on this program. Mr. Kenneth Scott appeared before the committee some 10 days ago and gave us 75 pages of testimony. He raised all of the questions that you have raised.

The committee felt that we had given the Department a fair and generous hearing and had not the slightest idea that the Department wanted to make any further presentation. The members of the committee voted to make certain changes in the bills as introduced and struck out one complete section, but then gave a unanimously favorable recommendation to the remainder of the bill. That legislation which had the support of both sides was scheduled to come before the House this afternoon. On Saturday, I first learned that you had sent a request, not to the committee and not to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, but rather to the minority leader asking that he use every possible means to defeat the passage of this legislation.

In the meantime, you had accompanied the President of the United States to several of the drought-stricken areas. You and the President have given out a number of statements asserting your desire to be of prompt assistance to the drought sufferers, but you have proposed no concrete program other than to ask for additional money, a large part of which has already been authorized by the House. Your action is now preventing the passage of legislation which every member of the Agriculture Committee seemed to believe was desirable and helpful to the drought-stricken people.

I must, therefore, come to the regretful conclusion that the congressional advisers have no functions other than to share the criticism of the Department's actions. Since I have never exercised any influence, since my advice has never been taken and is no longer even asked, it seems to me that my continued membership on this advisory group serves no useful purpose. If I could see where my continuation on this group could be of any possible help to the suffering farmers and ranches of the drought area, I would certainly continue to serve regardless of any embarrassment that it might be to me, but inasmuch as it seems clear that I am helping no one except the Department—and that only in the matter of sharing blame—I believe that it would be in the interest of a clear understanding for me to remove myself. I am, therefore, resigning from this advisory or consultative group effective today.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,  
Congressman.

I feel, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, that the Members of this House should not be made the fall guys

for the Department of Agriculture, and for one I do not propose to continue in such a position. I hope that the membership of the House will bear this attitude of the Department in mind when we take up the drought relief bill, which was reported by an unanimous vote of the House Committee on Agriculture. It is my hope that a rule may be granted this afternoon and that this bill may come before the membership of this House on tomorrow, in which event I hope all of those who believe in the integrity of this House, and the right of the Congress to determine legislation rather than merely to accept that which is forced upon us by the Department, will be here ready to record themselves in favor of a congressional determination of policy. I hope that we may adopt and that you will be here ready to implement a prompt program of relief for the drought-stricken areas rather than simply a newspaper program of expressions of regret about a drought situation that is affecting a very vast area of our country.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

TIRED OF BEING A GOAT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, during the past 22 years, the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan has probably cast as many if not more "No" votes than any other Member of the House.

He was forcefully reminded of this fact during the last campaign by his Democratic opponents.

In truth and in fact, the "No" votes, while negative in form, were affirmative in effect, because they were against wasteful, unnecessary spending, against the surrender of any part of our national sovereignty, in favor of the efficient expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars and adherence to our constitutional form of government.

No apology is now made for any of those votes.

Just a few days ago, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey suggested that, if we continued to tax and spend at our present rate, we might experience a depression that would make your hair curl.

The morning's press indicates that Mr. Humphrey has, to a certain extent, hinted that it might be necessary, in case of such a depression, to authorize a series of public works to take up the shock of unemployment.

That is nothing new. We did that back in the Roosevelt days. And it may be necessary and helpful as a temporary remedy.

Today's press carries the statement that, last night, 83-year-old former President Herbert Hoover, referring to Humphrey's hair-curling statement, said, "Mine has already been curled once—and I think I can detect the signs."

Since his inauguration, President Eisenhower has twice pointed out the necessity of lessened Federal spending if



we were to avoid financial disaster—a depression.

Nevertheless, the President called upon the House to give him, and it overwhelmingly did give him, a blank check for the use of the military forces to defend the territorial integrity, the political independence, not of the United States of America, but of Middle East nations. That authority if exercised means the spending of additional billions of dollars—a further trend toward inflation.

During the last election, the officials of practically every pressure group in this country were on my political back, because I had not, over the years, gone along with their every demand.

Compliance with 95, or even 99 percent of their proposed legislative program was not enough. Failure to bow the head and bend the knee on every occasion was sufficient to justify a decree of political liquidation.

While many—no doubt a majority—of the Members of the House realize that deficit spending must end, the record shows that a majority continue to vote for increasing governmental expenditures. Many of them demanded by the Administration.

While I may or I may not be a candidate for Congress in 1958, Members of the House will understand what I mean—at least I hope they will—when I here and now state that I am weary of refusing to go along with pressure groups demanding ever increasing Federal expenditures, of consistently voting against legislation calling for the expenditure of billions of dollars for foreign aid while others avoid criticism, political opposition, by consistently supporting the wasting of billions of our dollars abroad.

I was the only Member of Congress from Michigan who voted against giving the President authority to spend \$200 million abroad, authority to use the Armed Forces to protect other countries.

It all boils down to this. If a majority of the Congress is determined, as it seems to be, to continue increasing the taxpayer's burden by voting for every appropriation which is necessary to comply with the demands of the one-worlders, the internationalists, the rulers of other countries—the spending of billions of dollars abroad for the benefit of other peoples—I have about reached the conclusion that it might be well, if we are determined to spend those dollars, to spend them here in America for the benefit of our own people—especially for the benefit of those who now, through no fault of their own, find it difficult to obtain food, shelter, and clothing.

Why should I attempt to force economy on the Federal Government if, at the same time, an equal or far greater sum is being wasted abroad?

If continued inflation is to ruin us, if a depression is inevitable, why not, while it is on its way, spend our money here at home?

Why should I make the people of my district mad at me if the administration and the Congress are to pour their dollars down rat holes across the seas?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I obtained a copy, which I have in hand, of the United Nations telephone directory. I do not know how many of you have seen it, but it is an interesting publication.

In view of the fact that this is the first appropriation bill of the session, I thought I ought to take a minute or two to call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to a place where savings might be made. You understand, of course, that the Congress appropriates at least one-third of the running expenses of this modern Tower of Babel, known as United Nations headquarters.

Let me read you some of the clubs that are listed in this U. N. telephone directory:

The Art Club, the Badminton Club, the Ballet Club, the Ballroom Dancing Club, the Bowling Club, the Bridge Club, the Chess Club, the Cricket Club, the Drama Club, the Golf Club, the Gym Club, the Motion Picture Club, the Music Club, and the Press Club. Then there is the Recreation Council, the Singers Club, the Skating Club, the Ski Club, the Softball League, the Stamp Club, the Table Tennis Club, the Tennis Club, the Volley Ball Club, and the World-Wide Club.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], being the good angler that he is, might be disappointed in that they have no fishing club.

Then they have in addition to the above listed clubs, the granddaddy of all clubs. It is listed as "Clubs—general information." Evidently if you cannot get the information you want from these various clubs you can call "Clubs—general information"—and get what you want.

I have looked this list over pretty carefully. Each of these clubs has an office and each has a telephone. None of them is duplicated, that is, no two of these clubs are in the same office, so that each has an office and a telephone. I assume, and I think it is logical to assume, that the United Nations, using American tax dollars, provides a secretary at each of these offices and telephones. I suggest that when they come before you looking for an appropriation this year you of the committee investigate what they have been spending.

I might call your attention to the fact that there is a "Delegates' Bar—North," and a "Delegates' Bar—South." I do not know why there is no "Delegates' Bar—East" or "Delegates' Bar—West," unless the delegates, the Russians in particular, would rather drink their vodka in the north or the south.

There is also the London School of Economics Society, and it also has its own office and telephone number. I do not know what the London School of Economics Society might be, but I assume that is the place where people are taught to value and devalue money at will, how to escape interest payments to the United States on the money that they owe, and how to influence this country to issue 95-day paper to the tune of nearly a billion dollars so that we pay the Brit-

ish for their invasion of and aggression upon Egypt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am most happy to yield to my friend the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One of my colleagues advises me that while I was called out to the phone, not by the White House, the gentleman mentioned the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan. Now, do not worry about it. I will go along with you on any economy program that you would like to sponsor.

Mr. GROSS. I thought, perhaps, that being the good fisherman that you are, the U. N. ought to have a fishing club to go along with a ski club, a soccer club, a ballet club, and a ballroom-dancing club.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, wait a minute, I do not know about the last two. So far as this fishing business is concerned, I buy my own tackle and I dig my own bait, and when I catch them, I clean my own fish. But, if you have noticed here, the Committee on the Interior has found plenty of land where there are many lakes and streams on which they hunt and fish. Have you noticed that? And the facilities to get to them in the armed services. So if I can get on the Committee on the Interior, I can get to go on some of those trips.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to know that the gentleman from Michigan digs his own bait, but I suspect most of the U. N. club members spend most of their time cutting bait with which to catch American suckers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I never cut any bait for them. I will admit they catch plenty of suckers.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I dare predict that when the history of this era is written, this administration will be referred to as the great buck-passing administration. The President has passed the buck to us on domestic policy. He has passed it to us on foreign policy. He has passed it to us on monetary policy. He has passed it to us for budget-making.

I do hope, in fact I am almost certain, that this great Committee on Appropriations and the leadership of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is going to do a good job in cutting that budget.

I have a suggestion to make, and I do hope the Appropriations Committee will not think that one who is not a member of that committee is presumptuous in indicating a course of action. I suggest that the head of every Department seeking an appropriation be advised that unless that Department comes in and shows to the committee how it can cut the proposed budget by at least 10 percent, that you will cut their request 10 percent straight across the board. If they cannot come in and justify the figures submitted, warn them that the first 10 percent is going to come out of the salaries of the exempt jobs. Tell them that you







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued February 7, 1957  
For actions of February 6, 1957  
85th-1st, No. 22

## CONTENTS

Budget.....11,17	Flood control.....19	Paperwork management.....4
Committee assignments....7	General Counsel.....8	Personnel.....3,16
Committee investigations.5	Grazing.....1	Potatoes.....21
Corn program.....12	Legislative program.....6	Statehood.....10
Dairy prices.....15	Marketing.....18	Surplus food.....20
Drought relief.....1,9	Natural resources.....14	Taxation.....2
Family farm.....13	Nominations.....8	Transportation.....2

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed deferred grazing bill. Senate committee ordered reported nomination of Farrington as USDA General Counsel.

## HOUSE

1. DROUGHT RELIEF. Passed as reported, by a vote of 270 to 108, H.R. 2367, to establish a deferred grazing program for drought stricken areas. As passed the bill provides for deferred grazing payments in designated drought areas to farmers and ranchers at rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the county, giving consideration to the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors. Payments to a person in any county would be limited to \$5,000 for any year. This program is to be in addition to any other disaster relief programs in operation. pp. 1410-1421

Rep. Martin inserted the statement of this Department opposing passage of bill until recommendations of the Department are submitted for consideration. p. 1415

2. TRANSPORTATION. Received from the President the annual report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (H. Doc. 88). p. 1410

Received a resolution from the Idaho Legislature favoring the repeal of the tax on interstate transportation. p. 1431

3. PERSONNEL. Rep. Staggers reviewed a magazine article indicating pay increases for Federal employees had lagged behind other groups, and urged immediate hearings on this subject. p. 1422

4. PAPERWORK MANAGEMENT. The Rules Committee reported with amendment H. Res. 128, to authorize continuation of the investigation of unnecessary printing and paperwork by the Government. p. 1430
5. INVESTIGATIONS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. Res. 139, authorizing investigations by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 1430  
The House Administration Committee approved in executive session several resolutions providing funds for investigations by several committees, including Interior and Insular Affairs (H. Res. 94); Post Office and Civil Service (H. Res. 139); and Judiciary (H. Res. 107).
6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that several resolutions providing funds for investigations of committees would be considered today; and that there is no program for consideration next week. p. 1424
7. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. House members on the Joint Committee on Defense Production were appointed. p. 1409

#### SENATE

8. NOMINATIONS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported the nomination of Robert L. Farrington to continue as General Counsel of this Department. p. D73

#### ITEMS IN THE APPENDIX

9. DROUGHT RELIEF. Rep. Breeding inserted a Western Retail Implement and Hardware Association resolution, which was presented to the President on Jan. 15, urging immediate relief for farmers and small-business men in drought areas. p. A802
10. STATEHOOD. Rep. Smith, Wis., inserted a constituent's article, "The Case Against Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska," and stated "this does not mean I necessarily agree with the writer's views, but I do think he has made an intelligent argument." pp. A810-811
11. BUDGET. Rep. Michel expressed concern about the size of the budget, stated that the people in his district are up in arms about it and inserted an editorial, "Biggest Revenue--Biggest Spending." p. A811  
Rep. Herlong inserted an editorial criticizing the President's budget and stating that "judging from his new budget, Ike seems to be trying to outdo Harry." pp. A820-821
12. CORN PROGRAM. Rep. McGregor inserted a letter from D. R. Stanfield, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc., setting forth the views of his board of trustees and urging legislation dealing with the corn program which would give farmers a choice between the 51 million soil-bank acreage and the 37 million acreage-allotment program. pp. A811-812
13. FAMILY FARM. Rep. Passman inserted an article stating that one industry has been over-looked that could "definitely save the family-sized farm and bring rural prosperity of a degree hitherto unknown," suggesting that farmers make homes for the aged men and women who wish to retire and urging that the farmers receive cooperation, guidance, and money to begin operating on a sound basis. p. A815





United States  
of America

Please return to  
CHIEF, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING  
Office of Budget and Finance

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 103

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1957

No. 22

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 7, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, who art here and everywhere, we thank Thee for the wise and bountiful provision which Thou art daily making for our spiritual and material welfare.

We penitently confess that we frequently demand and try to gain so much from life for ourselves and are little concerned about giving help and happiness and hope unto others.

Grant that each to the extent of his ability and all with equal fidelity may be coworkers with Thee in the glorious adventure of supplying every human need and of establishing on earth the kingdom of brotherhood.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who was the world's greatest servant and its only savior. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States.

### JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

FEBRUARY 5, 1957.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 712 (a) (2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I have appointed the following members of the Banking and Currency Committee as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: Hon. PAUL BROWN, of Georgia; Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas; Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama; Hon. HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa; Hon. GORDON McDONOUGH, of California.

Sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

### DO NOT WEAKEN THE NATIONAL GUARD

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the National Guard represents the development of our citizen-soldier tradition.

One of its major functions is to meet emergencies in the several States.

It is also a first line of reserve for the regular or professional Military Establishment.

The proposal, by the Defense Department, that all enlistees in the guard shall be required to complete 6 months of active-duty training with the Army, although understandable in its attempt to create a large, trained, and immediately available reserve, is not the only solution nor the desirable one.

The whole concept of National Guard training is that it will permit and attract

men for military training without disrupting their jobs or homelife.

It is designed to provide "a well-regulated militia," as specified in the Constitution. It is separate and distinct from the Regular Army.

To my mind the only question is how to increase its technical proficiency, without destroying the base upon which it relies for its existence. The proposed requirement for 6 months' active duty would dry up enlistments and regulate it out of existence. This could be a thinly disguised maneuver to eliminate the National Guard and to completely federalize all military components.

Like most Americans, I have a high regard for our professional soldiers, but I have also observed how much of a trainee's time is wasted under the "hurry up and wait" programing.

Instead, I believe it is the responsibility of the regulars to streamline their training methods and provide an accelerated course.

The National Guard Association has recommended a fair compromise especially regarding men who have had no previous military experience. Otherwise active-duty training should be on a voluntary basis, consistent with the organization and the function of the National Guard.

We, in Massachusetts, are proud of the combat records of our National Guard units.

We resent and oppose any plan, however devious, to discredit the guard or to destroy its identity.

The arbitrary and coercive action of the Defense Department must be repudiated.

Let the guard, with its professional advisers, develop methods for realistic training close to home, that will approximate Army standards without destroying the base upon which the guard relies for its personnel and its very existence.



Pentagon politics must not be permitted to obscure the place and the value of our citizen-soldier reserve.

#### POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would allow individuals to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes political contributions to candidates for elective Federal offices in amounts up to \$100 annually.

This is essentially the same as a bill I sponsored in the House in 1955 and which was sponsored in the Senate by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING]. He has reintroduced the measure this year.

This bill would enlarge the base of political participation by encouraging modest political contributions from the average voter, thus reducing the dependence of candidates and parties on the large contributors.

Need for such a measure has been re-emphasized by the detailed study of campaign contributions and expenditures announced this week by the Senate subcommittee headed by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Others needs illuminated by that report would be taken care of in a bill I have already introduced in the House—H. R. 4146—and which the senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] has introduced in the Senate—S. 426. This bill, little changed from one which was reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee 2 years ago, would set realistic limits on campaign expenditures by candidates and committees set up to help them. At the same time, it would effectively limit the total amount of contributions which any person could make.

Enactment of both the \$100 exemption and the improved Corrupt Practices Act bills would go far toward removing many of the present faults in our elections processes.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 88)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation covering its activities for the year ended December 31, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 6, 1957.

#### HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 21)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service summarizing the activities of the health research facilities program.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 6, 1957.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### INDIAN HOSPITALS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2021) to provide for the construction of Indian hospitals and to provide for grants to assist in the construction of community hospitals which will serve Indians and non-Indians jointly, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### DEFERRED GRAZING PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 147 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2367, which is the bill concerning the drought situation in the Southwest. It provides a program for deferred grazing and soil conservation in the area that has been afflicted for a number of years by a very severe drought.

The Committee on Agriculture has reported the bill unanimously and has asked for the type of rule which has just been read to you. There was no objection to the consideration of the bill in the Rules Committee. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and the rule unanimously by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred-grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2367, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that this bill is before us this afternoon. It should have been passed the day before yesterday. I am sure, but for some kind of misunderstanding, it would have been passed at that time. I cannot believe that the minority leader would have delayed the action which was scheduled last Monday had he understood the problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that make any difference—any particular difference?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know that it makes a bit of difference in the world to



the gentleman from Michigan, but probably it makes a difference to some others.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does it make any difference to anybody. I was not asking just about myself.

Mr. POAGE. I can only answer for myself. I think that it makes considerable difference.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine.

Mr. POAGE. I am glad the gentleman is satisfied.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, wait a minute now, just a minute.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not satisfied. Do not put words in my mouth.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman. The gentleman can get time on the other side.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Thurmond Chatham, has made it impossible for the chairman of our committee to present this legislation to the House.

I shall, therefore, attempt to explain the measure. This bill is but an attempt to give some slight degree of protection to the soils in the vast drought-stricken area of the United States. This is not a relief bill. This bill does not solve the drought-distress problem. This bill is not a bill that will take care of the immediate needs of the farmers and ranchmen who have suffered so severely from the drought. It is to be hoped that we will have legislation that will extend a far larger measure of relief to these people. The President and the Secretary of Agriculture made a visit in the drought-stricken area something more than 3 weeks ago. They stated at that time that such action as could be taken would be taken in behalf of the drought area. They did not pass upon this legislation. This legislation is not an outgrowth of that visit. This legislation is not even connected with that visit. It was introduced sometime before that visit was made. The situation was so serious that 22 Members introduced identical bills. This bill bears my name, but Mr. ALBERT, of Oklahoma; Mr. BROOKS of Texas; Mr. BURLESON, of Texas; Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico; Mr. DIES, of Texas; Mr. DOWDY, of Texas; Mr. FISHER, of Texas; Mr. IKARD, of Texas; Mr. KILGORE, of Texas; Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. ROGERS of Texas; Mr. RUTHERFORD, of Texas; Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas; Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. YOUNG, of Texas; Mr. THOMPSON of Texas; Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado; Mr. EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma; Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. DIXON, of Utah; and Mr. CHRISTOPHER, of Missouri, all introduced identical bills. This action surely attests to the seriousness of the situation. This bill is not an attempt to evaluate the things that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture saw, nor is it an attempt to suggest that at some future day the President or the Secretary or both may not very properly come up here and make suggestions as to further legislation. As one member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I am sure I speak for all, we will welcome any such suggestions at any time they

are presented. But, up until this good moment, no suggestions whatsoever for the relief of the drought-stricken area have been presented to the Committee on Agriculture by either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture, and our committee knows that action is needed now. The drought does not wait, and we should not be asked to wait further. The President can still come—the Secretary can still come to Congress at any time either decides he wants to suggest any further aid for the drought sufferers. We will still be glad to have their suggestions, but we should not refuse to do what we can do at this time, just because the President and the Secretary do not have any thoughts to offer. This bill will not end the drought; it will not bring rain—but every member of our committee thought it would help. It is not a Democratic measure. It is not a partisan measure. It is a bill which comes to you with the unanimous recommendation of all of the members of our committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not correct to say that the substance and the principle embodied in this legislation already has been acted upon favorably by this House in the previous session when we had the soil-bank legislation before us?

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman correctly expresses it, although this House in the Albert amendment went much farther than this bill goes. The far-reaching Albert amendment was adopted by a majority vote of this House. We proposed at that time to extend the principle of deferred grazing all over the Nation, whether there was any emergency, drought, or disaster, or not. It was in a sincere effort to meet the objection of the Secretary of Agriculture to that amendment, that this bill was introduced. The Secretary stated at the time that amendment was adopted that he felt it was not a proper part of the soil bank. He felt it was improper to include grazing provisions in the soil bank. No objection was raised to the idea of encouraging deferred use of pasture land. So we introduced these bills, carefully amending only the disaster relief program and not touching the soil-bank program at all, in the sincere belief that by so doing we were meeting the objection of the Secretary of Agriculture. We confined this bill and its operation to those counties that have been declared by the Secretary of Agriculture to be disaster areas. This bill is not of universal application, but deals only with those counties that have been found to be suffering from serious disaster.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, when he finds that it would be desirable for the protection of the soil to encourage deferred grazing shall promulgate a program of deferred grazing, in which he is authorized to pay to the landowner not less than the normal rental value of the land for not less than 12 months, but not to exceed more than 3 years after the termination of the disaster. Frankly, that is all that is left in the bill, because section 5 has been removed by the committee, and there will

be a committee to take section 5 out of the bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I think I heard you say this took care of so-called distressed drought areas.

Mr. POAGE. That is all.

Mr. WIER. The meat of your bill is for the Southwest drought areas: How about the drought area that has been placed under distress conditions in South Dakota?

Mr. POAGE. This bill covers every area that has been declared a disaster area. Unfortunately the larger part of those disaster areas are in 6 or 7 Southwestern States, but these disaster areas do extend over nearly half of the United States.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman inform the House if this was not done, or similar action taken, that had the same effect in the case of drought areas on certain crops under the soil bank last year—in the case of corn for instance? I think where the drought had hit those areas they were allowed to put these crops under the soil bank at that time, were they not?

Mr. POAGE. Of course our committee has heard a great deal of testimony as to the effect of the soil bank in the corn areas last year. It seems to me that the result was to pay some \$179,000,000 of money to those people but not to do what the soil bank was expected to do—that is this payment did not reduce the corn crop. But this is not a bill that is going to enrich a group of people as those payments did but it is a bill that is going to encourage a group of people to keep from further abusing the soil that is about to lose its turf. I do not think the soil bank payments to corn farmers last year had that result. They simply put money in the people's pockets. This bill is to protect the Nation's soil. It offers the only practicable method of doing so in this area.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Further, with reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], the provisions of this bill are flexible, are they not, and a county not now in a drought area, should it become designated a drought area, can be included under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. Any area that becomes a drought disaster area can be placed under the provisions of this bill by the Secretary.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is not that circumscribed somewhat in that grazing must be the chief source of income in that area?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. The bill relates only to grazing land.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In other words, the drought county that has some



farming and some grazing might not come under the provisions of the bill even though it is a total drought area.

Mr. POAGE. The Secretary would have the discretion to determine whether there was enough grazing involved to justify the imposition of the program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the Secretary also determine when the deferred grazing period shall end?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, with this one exception: The bill provides that he cannot make the period for less than 12 months, and the reason was that the committee felt it was so plain it would be an utter waste of money to make payments for a period less than 12 months. Where grazing is deferred for less than a full year there would not be a chance of letting the grass reseed. We provided that the minimum must be 12 months.

Mr. GROSS. And it is left to someone's discretion to open it again after it recovers?

Mr. POAGE. I think we are faced with this situation in all the eastern edges of the drought area, let us say on the perimeter of the drought area, but I am more familiar with the eastern edge of that perimeter than any other. In that area you will find that the Secretary will probably need only 1-year contracts because probably 1 year's deferment is all that land will need for recovery. Where it is a little more severely damaged he will probably give 2-year contracts, feeling that 1 year will not cure the situation; and in the most severe portions he undoubtedly will give 3-year contracts, and that is as far as he can go under the terms of this bill. There are undoubtedly areas in which he will give 3-year contracts. The bill gives him discretion between 1, 2, and 3-year periods.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me whether the bill as worded would help our Missouri counties.

Mr. POAGE. Not unless the Secretary of Agriculture decides that the Missouri counties are a disaster area. I know there is much discussion about that matter. From all I have heard, conditions particularly in the western and southwestern counties of Missouri are desperate, but to date the Department of Agriculture has not declared those counties to be a portion of the disaster area.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But this would be an enabling act which should benefit the situation in those counties.

Mr. POAGE. The minute the Secretary decides that they are disaster counties the terms of this bill are as applicable there as anywhere else in the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I just suggest from reading page 2 of the bill that that again is circumscribed by the lan-

guage in which grazing is decided to be a substantial factor in agricultural production.

Mr. POAGE. Right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And if the gentleman will yield for 1 further question, I refer to lines 22 to 24:

Payment to any person for deferred grazing of land in any one county shall not exceed \$5,000 in any one year.

There are large landowners who own land in 2, 3, or 4 counties. Would that language mean that he could get up to \$5,000 in each county where he happened to have land located?

Mr. POAGE. It does, because there are probably not more than three dozen such owners in the whole United States. In discussing the administration of the act we felt that it would be extremely complex to require every contract to be sent back to Washington to have it checked against every other county in the United States. The administration of this thing would increase in cost far more than the amount you could save by not making those few payments than if we had taken the other approach and tried to say that if you had more than \$5,000 anywhere in the United States you are ineligible. This program is to be operated on a county basis, as the gentleman knows.

It is handled through the county offices. Smith County does not know what the record is in Jones County. There is no way of knowing it for the 3,000 counties of the United States except to send every contract to Washington and have every contract audited here. The cost of that would be out of proportion to the savings.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It would be possible for an individual owning land in several counties to get \$5,000 for each county.

Mr. POAGE. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Is this an outright grant or loan?

Mr. POAGE. It is neither a grant or a loan. It is a direct payment for performing a service to the United States.

Mr. O'NEILL. It is like burying the potatoes in the ground?

Mr. POAGE. No, I do not think it is like burying potatoes in the ground for this reason. When you bury potatoes, you destroy them. This bill prevents the destruction of the grass. I do not think the gentleman understands the situation in the Southwest.

Mr. O'NEILL. We have had tornadoes up in the northeast section, we have had hurricanes in the northeast section, we have had floods up in the northeast section. The people in our section of the country have suffered as much in the past 2 years as you have in Texas, and we feel sorry for you. But we do not come in here and ask for handouts. We had a bill up here last year but you people from Texas put a crippling amendment on that bill so that it would not work. We of Massachusetts, we in the northeast section, had to work out our

own problems. You people down there with your oil wells, why not work out your own problems without coming to the Congress and saddling the expense on the people of the entire United States.

Mr. POAGE. Unfortunately, it is not the same people who have the oil wells that have these little ranches. They are entirely different people. It is for the very reason the gentleman has discussed that we have put a \$5,000 limitation in here. That was placed there, in part at least, so that the benefits of this bill will not go to the people who do not need it. We understand that there are people in Texas who do not need any help to defer their pastures, just as there are people in Boston who do not need the hundred-million-dollar subsidy contained in the insurance bill we gave New England a year or two ago, but I do not recall that the gentlemen offered to make them ineligible for those benefits. Where there is one man in Texas who has made money out of oil, there are about 3,500 who have never made a thin dime on oil. Those people are in just as dire circumstances as they would be if there were not somebody from Dallas or Houston who had made a bunch of money out of oil.

Mr. O'NEILL. It is a local problem and it should be handled on a local basis by the State.

Mr. POAGE. It is not a local problem. This is involving the life of America itself, and all of America.

Mr. O'NEILL. Oklahoma is also a great wealthy oil State. You were in here last year or the year before for your tidelands and things of that nature. But whenever you have a problem like this you come to the people of the entire Nation and ask them to save you.

Mr. POAGE. This is a problem that relates to the preservation of the soil of America. In every State, in every county, where the Secretary of Agriculture, whether he be the present Secretary or some other man, finds that there is a danger of losing your soil, this applies. History teaches us that vast areas of this world have been overgrazed and have passed from productive pastures into barren deserts which today support no one.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am wondering, Does this bill cover only emergencies of a drought nature or does it cover any kind of emergency situation?

Mr. POAGE. It is only applicable to drought cases. We had a tornado in my hometown which killed 113 people but that did not mean we had to keep cattle off the pastures next year. It is only applicable to drought because drought is the only kind of disaster that makes it necessary to lighten your livestock load on your pastures.

Mr. McGOVERN. What about provision for a drought in a county where the entire county is not declared eligible for drought relief, where you have spotty damage covering one or more farms in that county?

Mr. POAGE. If the Secretary of Agriculture declares it to be a disaster



area the bill applies whether he declares a large or small area. But that discretion is with the Secretary under existing law and it is not changed by this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. Hearings were held on the bill. I would like to have heard more witnesses or more definite statements from the department as to their attitude on the bill, but those were not forthcoming at that time. However, the committee felt that this was an emergency matter that should be dealt with very promptly so that a beginning could be made in the consideration of this important bill.

I will not go into the merits of the bill. One section dealing with protein feeds was stricken out of the bill, so all that remains in the legislation is the matter dealing with deferred grazing. If the bill works out in actual practice in accordance with the intent of the author of the bill, it should be a good measure and do some good in creating better pasturage in the southwest area wherever there is need for this kind of a policy.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Was Secretary Benson called in on this piece of legislation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Secretary Benson did not appear.

Mr. O'NEILL. Did he send any communications?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not have it, but I understand there was an exchange of letters. Undoubtedly his objections will be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. O'NEILL. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that legislation like this would come before the Congress without a recommendation or nonrecommendation from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I will say in answer to the inquiry of my friend from Massachusetts that Secretary Benson has sent a letter up here, and he is opposed to the measure as it now stands.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I would like to ask two questions. First, as to the application of this bill, does it apply to Government-owned lands?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is my understanding that it does not apply to Government-owned lands.

Mr. BATES. Is that the situation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. BATES. The next question I had was this: If the fishermen up in my area decide not to fish any more because the fish are becoming depleted, is that not the same situation that you have here? The farmers are stopping farming so that they can restore the land; therefore, do you believe the fishing indus-

try should get a subsidy along the same lines as are the farmers in this particular bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In reply to that question, I find that several years ago in your area the fishermen reduced the size of the catch in order to raise the price; that is, on codfish.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman does not understand the situation at all, because that is not the case.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I like to fish, just like my colleague from Michigan does, but I do recall one instance, and I talked with some of the fishermen and they told me that they were going to reduce the size of the catch in order to raise the price.

Mr. BATES. I enjoy the comments of the gentleman, but I would like to get an answer to my question. Would the gentleman tell me specifically what is the difference between a fisherman stopping fishing and a farmer stopping farming? Why should not the fisherman get a subsidy as well as the farmer in this particular case? What is the difference?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is a lot of difference, but we will not have time to go into that argument now.

Mr. BATES. The point is, we never do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, we have argued that a great many times here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To answer the question of my very, very dear friend from Massachusetts, it was only a few years ago that we did make an appropriation to teach them how to be experts to catch more fish. Do you remember that one?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman recalls the authorization.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you not get the money?

Mr. BATES. We never got the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, that was a dirty trick.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I could not be in the Hall when the debate first started. First of all, this is no laughing or funny matter.

If you lived on the eastern plains of Colorado, in my own district, or in the district of Mr. CHENOWETH; or if you lived in the Panhandle of Texas or on the plains of Oklahoma, you would realize what it means to see your cows without sufficient feed so that they are not even strong enough to get up without the help of the farmer, and you would then begin to realize that what we are trying to do in this bill is not funny business in any sense.

Really and truly, I was completely surprised when I found that the Department was opposed to this bill. I had no idea that they were going to oppose it

and only knew about it after seeing a news item in the paper.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this morning there was mentioned the attitude of the Department of Agriculture toward this measure. But in the final analysis is it not the Congress which should legislate? I believe the gentleman certainly would answer "Yes" to that. Furthermore, I would much rather have the opinion of the membership of the great legislative Committee on Agriculture than I would that of the top echelon of the Department of Agriculture today.

Mr. HILL. Of course, I am glad to get the gentleman's opinion. But we must work together on agriculture. That is why we have a Department of Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to some of the provisions in the bill that I think take care of many objections that might be made. First of all it refers to pasture land that has been used as pasture. Would you tell me how anyone can get into the program that has 10,000 or 15,000 acres that have not been used as pasture? He cannot.

The second thing is that this land—and I hope someone will correct me if I am wrong—if a cattle producer or a livestock grower has not been using this land, he cannot get in under this program. There is no way for him to get in under the program.

Also, if he does get into the program, \$5,000 is the most that he can receive at any one time or in any one year. Furthermore, he must agree to follow out the program for a full year. It is only a 3-year program. There is no reason why the House should not pass this bill and send it over into the other body where changes can be made and, of course, will be offered. Then the House can agree or disagree at its pleasure. If there are any provisions in the bill anyone does not like, it is certainly his privilege to raise objections to it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am in perfect sympathy with the objectives of the bill, but I am wondering how we are going to police it. Most of this land in the southwest counties, in the various States are not pasture. There would have to be some policing. There would be some farmers who would not go into the program. They would have a right to run their cattle out. There are no fences there. I hope we are not going to have to have a Government bureaucrat on every section of land to make sure that the cattle are not getting off onto the wrong section.

I am sure the gentleman can see the problem of policing this. I am wondering if we are not opening up a Pandora's box here, or whether there is no bottom to the pit.

There was a question raised here concerning the State of South Dakota and Idaho having no counties that would come under this program; also there are counties in my State that apparently



would be precluded from being in the program. Perhaps some of those counties do not use the land for grazing all the time; that is, not all of the counties, but grazing is the main activity. As I understand it, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, and other States where they do have grazing would not even come under the program.

Mr. HILL. Of course, No. 1: This is the same old jinx that follows every bill concerning the farmer. When a farmer wants some assistance they always say you cannot police it. Let me say a word about that. I should like to see you police the traffic in the city of Washington, but you do not remove your traffic officers and repeal your traffic laws because you cannot police the traffic.

As far as policing is concerned, most of our agricultural programs are policed at home in the localities, in the counties where the projects originate. You have the same thing in various types of cultivation of certain crops that are planted to increase the quality of your soil. They are all policed at home at the local level.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. I see nothing in the report about the ultimate cost of this program. That certainly must have come up before the committee. What would be the anticipated final cost?

Mr. HILL. I think the author of the bill has an idea of how much money it will cost, but it is a little hard to tell how many acres will be participating. I do not assume there are going to be millions and millions of acres. I think if you want to help the small farmer, you will get the small farmer with the small herd in the small area where he runs the cattle, in on this program.

Mr. O'NEILL. We all have sympathy for the farmers to whom the gentleman refers, but how much is this program going to cost?

Mr. POAGE. No one can tell what the participation will be, but I think we can all agree that it certainly would be not as much as 18 or 20 million in this program. I think it would be very remarkable if you got that much. The program will probably cost an average of \$1.25 an acre. Nobody knows how much you can get, but I think if you can get 20 million acres you will be exceeding everybody's wildest expectations.

Mr. O'NEILL. You certainly must have come up with some idea of what would have to be appropriated.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly I came up with the thought that we would have at the outside 18 or 20 million acres. That is the thought. It may not be correct.

Mr. O'NEILL. Then the gentleman figures it will cost around \$20 or \$25 million?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In the committee it was discussed as being between \$15 and \$25 million, but in my opinion you will not get that much participation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If no one seems able to tell us approximately how much it will cost, can you do it some way by comparison? Will it cost as much as the foreign-aid program would cost?

Mr. HILL. I cannot compare it with foreign aid.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean it is not as much, or is it more?

Mr. HILL. Let us say not as much. The gentleman can answer his own question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not have asked it if I could have answered it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The question was raised about the fairness of this program to the farmers who do not graze. Were they not put into the soil-bank program last year? Both in and out of drought areas are not farmers eligible to receive not only the rental but the profits they would have received if they had raised a successful crop on land that they put into the soil bank?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct. Our entire soil-bank program is in the formative stage. There is no reason in the world why you should not take pasture and submarginal land and put it in the conservation part of the soil-bank program.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. Is it not a fact that the bill gives the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to prescribe the terms and conditions on which this is granted, and that would mean the authority to require the States to match this money if he so desired?

Mr. HILL. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that, because I neglected to read this section. I am reading from section 3, which is the key to the whole bill:

The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration.

Under that clause the Secretary can set up local committees, and the farmers or stockmen that came into the program would be absolutely bound voluntarily to follow the rules and regulations adopted by the Department of Agriculture. I say under that section the cities and the municipalities and the counties and the States could all cooperate. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thought that this bill had been pretty thoroughly argued out and that everyone understood it. I am a little regretful that there has been some play of words here about one part of the country getting more than some other part of the country. I think I have about as good a sense of humor as anyone in the House of Representatives, but I want

you to know it is a pretty serious situation, so serious that it is something that cannot be played with either with words or with lack of action. In regard to the Secretary of Agriculture, I remarked here on the floor the other day, I do not think the democratic form of Government, under which we are conducting the affairs of this country, sets up any provision where the Secretary of Agriculture can veto something that the representatives of the people who are sent here to legislate provide to be included among our laws. This law is nothing in the world but good, sound commonsense in regard to soil conservation. I had hoped that the provisions similar to those contained in this bill would have been included in the soil-bank provisions. And they would have been had Mr. ALBERT's amendment been adopted when the soil-bank program was before the House. But, although the House did see fit to adopt it, the other body struck it. One of the reasons, let me say, I think, was because the Secretary of Agriculture at that time said he did not want to mix up the soil-bank program with anything in the world that might help out drought relief, for the simple reason that he wanted the soil bank devoted solely to the reduction of surpluses, and not to help anybody out who was affected by the drought. All right, well and good. The Congress did just exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture said he wanted on that; although I voted for the Albert amendment then, and I am going to vote for this bill today.

What we have done is to come back to the Congress with a soil conservation measure that is designed to provide drought relief that will protect the soil of this Nation. It has been remarked here on the floor today that this is not a national problem. I appreciate the concern of my friends from the Northeast. I want to say I have helped them out many times on these measures and I will continue to do so in the future. But, this is definitely a national problem because if I could take you today to my district, which is in the geographical center of this drought area, and show you how the land has deteriorated, many of you would not believe it. In one section, our grass has been eaten off by the cattle and the top soil has been removed by the winds clear down to the hardpan. It is going to take 5 years to reseed that and to grow that back. And that is a minimum estimate of the time that it will take. In addition to that plague, in one section of my district we were hit by a plague that I am sure some of you have never heard of, a plague of grass termites. They came in under the grass and ate the roots of the grass. When the cattle eat that grass, they lift out the whole tuft of grass and nothing in the world but the hardpan is left. It looks just exactly like the bare spots on a baseball diamond between bases where the runner runs. If we do not do something to relieve that situation and afford some temporary relief to these people who are making a living off that land, there is nothing in the world for them to do but to move to the metropolitan areas. I think we, in all fairness



to everyone concerned, should give at least fair consideration to this matter and understand what this bill does. My friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has explained to you exactly what it is intended to do. It is not intended to grant anybody anything. It is intended to provide a means to let these people keep their heads above the waters of the economic sea. That is what it is designed to do. Unless something is provided, the 6 years of the drought that we have already had, and we got another one this year, is going to engulf a lot of them and you are going to have a lot of the little ranchers move off the land and then you will be in a worse situation than you have ever dreamed of.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to commend the gentleman for the splendid statement he has made as to the real and grave necessity behind this legislation and for calling attention to the national implications involved in this Dust Bowl problem if something is not done to check it. The folks who live in the metropolitan areas or in areas far removed from the Dust Bowl may be a year or two later than the folks who live in the dust bowl in feeling the implications of what happens down there. But they will feel them as certainly as the sun rises in the morning, if we do not do something to check it. I think the gentleman has made a strong point in calling the attention of the Members to the national implications of this Dust Bowl problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There is one other thing I want to say about the national situation. You remember back in the depression days this Government in many instances, because people had overgrazed land and overplanted land, had to buy up submarginal land. That land the Government has been restoring all along, and much of it has been brought back to production. If we pass legislation of this kind we will afford an opportunity to the landowner, the person living on the land, to restore that land. Otherwise, you let it go into worse condition, and then the next thing we will be back in submarginal land-buying program by the Government.

Mr. O'NEILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'NEILL. I was going to say to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Oklahoma that if we could get rid of this tax-depletion exemption on oil those States will be able to handle the situation very easily.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Surely, the gentleman must be joking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the questions that have been asked, I think it is proper that the position of the Department of Agriculture should be known.

First, I want to say that they are opposed to the passage of this legislation in its present form. They think it would create as many problems as it would solve.

I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the statement of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

#### DEFERRED GRAZING BILL, H. R. 2367

The Department of Agriculture vigorously opposes the passage of H. R. 2367. Administration of the bill as it is written would be nearly impossible, and at best, would create more problems than the bill could solve. These problems include:

1. Much of the rangeland involved is not fenced and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to enforce regulations setting aside a given number of acres out of an unfenced range.

2. The withdrawing of a substantial acreage of rangeland would bring about additional hardships, since there is not enough grazing land now with all the available range being grazed.

3. If an actual reduction of grazing lands could be accomplished it would be followed by a liquidation of cattle and sheep which would be disastrous to market prices.

4. The Department recognizes the critical problem faced by some livestock men, but H. R. 2367 is so written as to provide payments indiscriminately and without regard to need. The result would be that much of the funds provided would go into the pockets of wealthy cattlemen and absentee landowners, instead of helping the cattleman who is in real trouble.

5. The language of the bill leaves serious question as to whether payments under the deferred grazing program would be authorized for ranchers and farmers on federally owned grazing land as well as to those on privately owned grazing land. Neither is it clear whether the bill is intended to apply to land which is not now used for grazing, but which may have been so used in the past.

6. The bill does not provide for any State participation and the Department feels that abuses of such programs using the taxpayers' money can largely be avoided if the State will contribute a reasonable share of the cost of the program.

7. The bill would not only be difficult to administer because of the reasons noted above, but it does not provide authority of a regulatory nature other than the withholding of payment or the recovery of payment already made in the event the program provisions are violated. This would tend to encourage violations, the Department believes, under the reasoning that even if the claimant is found in violation the worst the Government can do is to take the payment away from him without any additional penalty.

8. Such a program as this bill provides moves in the direction of Government regulation and control of the livestock industry.

9. The scope of the program is so large that 40 to 50 million acres may be involved with a cost of \$40 million estimated. In view of the magnitude of the program, it seems unreasonable that the sponsors of the bill did not ask for a formal report from the Department of Agriculture, did not invite representatives of national farm organizations to testify, nor did representatives of national

livestock associations present their views. Some of these associations have already gone on record with resolutions opposing the principles embodied in H. R. 2367.

10. The President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior have recently made a survey of the drought area and a conference was held in Wichita to hear the recommendations of those closest to the problem. These recommendations have been further refined by the 190 representatives from 15 drought States who took part in the Wichita meeting, and their suggestions are now being received by the Department of Agriculture. It does not seem reasonable that these men who gave their time and energies in an effort to secure good drought legislation should be denied a voice in this matter, or that legislation should be hastily adopted before their recommendations can be heard.

11. The establishment of equitable payment rates will present serious problems because of the lack of completely adequate data. State averages cannot be assumed to be the same as the true rental value in every case, but due to selective participation, might be considerably more or less.

In brief, the Department has serious doubts that this bill, as written, could be administered even if enacted. We do not believe that it will do what it purports to do, and we believe that it would produce more problems than it solves in the drought-stricken areas.

We are deeply sympathetic to the problem facing our farmers and ranchers, and we expect to have complete and workable drought recommendations ready soon which will embody the recommendations made by those in drought areas. It would be hasty and ill-considered, however, to take action without hearing the livestock groups who will be most affected, the conferees at Wichita and major farm organizations.

The argument that the House can enact this bill and then leave it to the Senate or a conference committee to clean it up is hardly a sound legislative proposal.

Furthermore, the present broad drought program is working effectively.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the Department is not opposing this bill here today, because it hopes a satisfactory bill can be secured in the Senate.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, there you have heard the situation with that letter. If anybody was ever looking for an out that is certainly it. A lot of us from the great industrial States probably want to take it, but I am not going to. I have been voting for farm legislation since 1944, and so have many of my colleagues from the great industrial States.

There is before this body and there is before the Committee on Banking and Currency my bill to aid distressed economic areas in this Nation. It affects 25 or 35 entire congressional districts in more than a dozen States. Similar legislation was recommended by the President 2 years in a row; it is in the platform of both great political parties.

Many of the Members on both sides of the aisle from these farming and rural States if given half a chance have indicated they will be against that kind of law. Now, Mr. Chairman, if ever there was special pleading the farm legislation is it. I voted for subsidies; I voted for a library of law for the farming districts, and for my colleagues from farming sections at their request for years. We



have given you subsidies for everything but the squeal of your hogs, and I suppose you will soon get that; you are entitled to most of this because in the rest of the States we have got to eat and if you do not produce we do not eat.

But there are other national problems that go beyond the farm problem. While your cause is a sacred cow to the politicians of both parties, I speak, Mr. Chairman, of other serious economic problems that are equally serious affecting dozens of millions of people throughout this Nation, and when my bill is before the committee and the House I plead for your support. Remember today.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the statement was made that the Secretary of Agriculture is now opposed to this bill. I am sure that that correctly reflects the Secretary's position as of 1:45 this afternoon. But the Secretary of Agriculture did not express this opposition to the Agriculture Committee of this House. On the 17th day of last month the committee called upon the Department of Agriculture for its suggestions and advice on this matter. The Department of Agriculture sent the head of the drought division, Mr. Kenneth Scott, to testify before our committee. Every bit of this record of 75 pages is Mr. Kenneth Scott's testimony and it does not say that the Department is opposed to the bill. He was asked if the Department opposed the bill, but he did not answer either yea or nay.

Most of the objections that were just read to the House today were never presented to the Committee on Agriculture. Three or four of them were presented, were considered, and were answered. The letter which was just read did not state to whom these questions were addressed. They were not addressed to the Committee on Agriculture of the House nor have they ever been presented. They were not addressed to the Speaker of the House.

In addition to Mr. Scott's testimony, Under Secretary True D. Morse was before the committee and every page of this record is Mr. Morse's testimony about this bill. He did not present the objections that have been raised this afternoon.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the Secretary probably was going to give that information through the Washington Post as he has done in connection with some of the other matters or messages. It seems that he prefers to do that rather than to give them direct to our committees.

Mr. POAGE. I think so. The Secretary raised certain questions here today through the minority leader. He asks, How are you going to take care of land if it is not fenced? Well, most of this is fenced. The day of the free range is gone except in connection with Government land and this program does not involve Government land. Surely the Government can and will protect its own land from abuse. As to individuals, they

can do their own fencing or leave it undone. If a rancher has but one pasture he would have to put all his land in the program. If he wanted to put in only a part of his land he would have to build cross fences.

The Secretary fears that we are going to reduce the cattle population. Could there be a finer thing happen to the livestock industry than to reduce the cattle population of America? I think that everybody except the packers will agree that we have several million too many cattle.

In other words, he feels that the program is not going to be too effective. I do not think it is going to be very effective so far as reducing the cattle population is concerned. But to the extent it does reduce the cattle population it will be a double blessing. For every head it does reduce our cattle population that is to the advantage of every livestock grower in the country, whether he produces cattle, sheep, or hogs. It is certainly to the advantage of America to strengthen our livestock market.

The Secretary suggests that certain wealthy cattlemen would get most of this money. Obviously he has not read the provisions of the bill that limits payment to \$5,000. This denies many middle-sized ranchmen an opportunity to participate. Surely no one would want to make the bill any more restrictive.

The Secretary objects because the States are not required to participate in this program. I want to make it plain that I think one of my colleagues was in error when he said that the States do participate in the cost of this program. The Secretary is correct in saying that it does not provide for State participation any more than the present deferred-grazing program that we have had for the last 16 years so provides. Why should we require the desperately hurt States to pay part of a program to save the soil when the Federal Government pays all of the cost in other States, as it now does?

This leads me to the last important criticism. For 20 years the Department of Agriculture has administered grazing programs and it has had a very substantial participation. It has had as high as 35,000 farms some years and that program was, and is, applicable all over the United States. The Secretary has found no difficulty in administering it. This program is no more difficult to administer than the present deferred-grazing phase of the soil-conservation program that has been administered for 20 long years.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not also true that the final objection of the Secretary that it would not work was exactly the same objection he made to the soil-bank proposition when it was first proposed to him, at which time he said the soil bank would not work?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. The Secretary will embrace this program just as he has heretofore embraced that program; the Secretary will support this; the Secretary will go to the other body and sug-

gest that there are certain little amendments which he considers vital. It will then become the Benson program, and he will tell the country that it is a good program. I do not care whose name is to it. I simply want to see us save the soil of America.

No one has come here and made any practical suggestion as to how this soil could be saved other than by a program of deferred grazing. As far as I know, the soil-conservation people of this and of no other nation have found no other program to protect the turf. It must be done, else we will be spending many times this amount to reseed that self-same land. It costs \$20 to \$50 an acre to reseed it. It may cost us as much as \$3 an acre over a period of time to save it under this program. I think we would be most unwise to refuse to take this needed step, just because the Department did not think about it.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. It appears to me, even though there be some subsidy in the bill, that subsidies have been established since George Washington's time and that subsidies are fundamentally American.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, very few Members of this body are so young that they do not recall the days of the dust bowl. It was caused by failure to keep some degree of cover on drought-parched lands in the Middle West and Southwest.

What the Members may not realize is that we are now facing another dust bowl, some of it in the same area as that which occurred some 20 years ago.

Granting that we are now to have somewhere near adequate rainfall in the drought areas, we still face the necessity for reseeding and resodding the drought-parched areas. Even though the grass may start to grow back, when the summer sun begins to parch it again this coming summer the roots will have difficulty finding any moisture in the subsoil; and the sod poorly established, at best, will have a hard time sustaining itself through even a normal summer.

If cattle have been permitted to graze the new grass as fast as it appears, there will be no reseeding process and the resodding will not take place. Therefore, the cattle must be kept off until there has been sufficient rainfall and until sufficient time has passed, even though it be 2 or 3 years, for the sod to be thoroughly reestablished.

In the meantime, the cattlemen who would normally put their stock on these pastures remain in the precarious economic condition they now find themselves. The modest rental payments proposed in this bill provide the best means which the committee has been able to find for keeping the cattlemen



and their creditors in a reasonably solvent condition. We face a disaster which could seriously impair the Nation's economy, not alone that in the affected areas.

Let me stress to you that the cautious, almost fearful attitude of the Department of Agriculture will not get this job done. It will take bold and determined steps and it will take immediate action and not reluctant and hesitant measures after long delays. This legislation may not be perfect, but at least it is an effort and one which the drought victims certainly deserve at the hands of the Congress.

I urge the passage of the bill as reported out by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

#### PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire about the program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Committee on Rules has reported out several resolutions granting investigative authority to several committees of the House. They will be brought up tomorrow, and are as follows:

House Resolution 139, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

House Resolution 29, Committee on Foreign Affairs;

House Resolution 113, Committee on Public Works;

House Resolution 65, Committee on Veterans' Affairs;

House Resolution 128, authorizing the Committee on House Administration to continue investigation of Government printing; and

H. R. 1056, the military substandard housing bill.

I understand there is no controversy over them, and with the conclusion of these matters tomorrow, then the understanding between the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself with reference to next week will be applicable.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such program shall be applicable only to land which is normally used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the land. Such program in any county shall be made available to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain available for a period of not less than 3 years after the termination of such county as a major disaster area.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill in committee we were advised that the President was going to send to the Congress his recommendations for dealing with the drought situation. Now, everyone is aware that some 3 or 4 weeks ago the President went to the drought area along with the Secretary of Agriculture and others. Since that time more than 3 weeks have passed and yet we have not received any recommendations from either the Department or the President dealing with this proposition. Meanwhile the drought continues on the Great Plains of this country with increasing severity. Today the Department still complains that we should await the recommendations of the administration.

This reminds me of an incident that took place in my community when I was a small boy in southeastern Oklahoma—when a Government survey team was surveying that part of the country. One of the young engineers had a team of Government mules, one of which was severely injured when the tongue of a wagon pierced its stomach. The engineer's first reaction was to shoot the suffering mule, but after thinking it over, he thought to himself, "This is a Government animal. If I shoot the mule, I will probably have to pay for it." So he wired his superintendent for authority to kill the mule. The superintendent wired back and said that he had sent his request to the regional office with the recommendation that it be approved. Within a few days the mule died. A couple of weeks later the answer came back from the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., saying: "Dear sir, your request, forwarded to the superintendent and by him forwarded to the regional office, who in turn referred it to this Department, has been considered by the appropriate agency, and after due consideration you are directed to proceed immediately and shoot the mule." If we delay this matter until we have heard from the administration it may be too late to do any good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is not comparing the people of Texas to a mule, is he?

Mr. ALBERT. No; I am not comparing the people of Texas to a mule, but I am comparing the suffering in the drought-stricken area to the suffering that the mule experienced.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the gentlemen on the Democratic side should object to giving a little time for consideration of this

situation by the President. He made a special trip to the area. Just a few days ago they told him to go ahead and use the Army at his discretion over there across the ocean, did they not? What is so fussy about this? Why not wait until the President comes up with his considered solution?

I can understand why this bill is important. It gives these Texas gentlemen—but before I go into that, I would like to ask the gentleman who is in charge of the debate here today if there are any oil wells on this grazing land? That question is asked in all seriousness. As to this land which is to be subsidized, are there any oil wells on it?

Great silence over there. No answer. Texas is one of the richest States in the Union. There is more money down there apparently than in most other States. They have had a rapid growth in population and in wealth and they are making improvements all the time all along the way. They have shown they are amply able to handle their own State problems. This year they made a wonderful advance when they voted for Eisenhower. They are really going somewhere.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I am wondering if some of those oil wells might not be shut down, because I understand the price of gas is going up, that some of the production is being held down so that they may increase the price to the consumer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is due to this situation over around Suez, the canal being clogged up and the line of supply shut off, so that you and I and the rest of the people who use gasoline and oil are to pay a little more for it. So they will profit that way. Less oil, perhaps, but a higher price. There will not be any net loss to them down there.

This bill is important because it affords an opportunity to some to show the interested parties they are on the job.

Some of us have had just bowl legislation brought before us in others years. Do you remember that? I have been reading some of these Westerns and apparently the situation has always revolved around a contest between the grazing boys, the people who want to raise cattle, and the fellows who want to farm, between the ranchers and the sod busters. Unless I am very much mistaken, what happened in the years gone by has been this. A breaking up by plowing or grazing of sod which has been followed by a blowing away of good soil. We are told now that the grazing was so close that the cattle ate all the top off the grass and the roots became so loose that now we must pay subsidies to reseed because the roots were blown away when that land was plowed or grazed.

Well, you cannot have it both ways unless periodically the land is reseeded at Government expense. Now, I suppose we are to blame, we in other sections of the country, if we do not remedy their error.

When the water in Lake Michigan and Lake Erie and Lake Huron got high,



water let out by Canada which should have gone into Hudsons Bay, but was dumped down into Lake Superior, came down through the St. Marys River and finally got into other of the Great Lakes, and washed out the improvements, the homes, docks, and harbors we had in Wisconsin and both sides of Lake Michigan and in some of the other States. Members will remember that we were not given relief even though the fault was not ours. Did they give us any help then? No, no; they would not do that. Now, when you want water over there for your sanitary canal, or a little drinking water in Chicago—although I do not know why you would want to drink that stuff—the gentlemen from Chicago are asking for more water from Lake Michigan—but when you want that, the State Department says, “No, you have got to see Canada first; that is an international problem.”

Now, with reference to this Dust Bowl. Does not the fault lie with the people who lived there and misused the land? Is not that the reason for the present trouble?

Now they want us to come along and help pay them a subsidy to those who are being injured by a lack of rain and their own way of land use.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman regard it as a misuse of the land to continue to try to make a living if it is the only land a man has and there is no alternative to it?

What I am trying to say is that if the land cannot successfully be used for farming and that fact is known, one who insists upon trying to do the impossible—just for a quick profit—should not expect others to pay the loss when it comes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is just a silly interpretation of my statement. The gentleman is assuming there is no alternative. In my county we have poor, cold sand. We gave up trying to grow crops on it. I consider the misuse of the land is where a fellow goes along and insists on using grazing land for the growing of grain. There is some land that you cannot plow up and have it stay put. When rain fails, the wind blows, it just leaves that area. My Dutch grandfather from Pennsylvania used to rotate his crops. He never kept on plowing it and seeding it year after year. He let sod grow on it once in a while. He sowed wheat one year, had clover the next, and either planted corn or let it lie fallow the next. You plow up land that is not suitable for the growing of grain. You plow it up and seed it, harvest, and sell a crop year after year when the only sensible use is to use it for grazing?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman realize that the land that has been plowed is not eligible for this particular program? What the gentleman is saying may be true, but it does not relate to the matter in issue.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That would not be the first time a Congressman has talked about something that was not relevant, now, would it? However, from what information I have, knowing that we have rainless seasons or years folks are using the land just as though they were certain rain would fall as and when needed.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us just be fair about this situation. Our country has experienced subsidies since George Washington's time. They are just as American as George Washington was. We started out with the tariff under George Washington, and we have continued it. The American public has spent billions upon billions of dollars supporting the large manufacturers in the East. Believe it or not, I am not opposed to a tariff. I am not opposed to a reasonable tariff at all. I think they are entitled to some protection. I think it gives good security to our whole economy.

In addition, the slick magazines come through the mails and pay almost nothing for that privilege. That is based on the need to disseminate information in this great democracy. We give them practically a free ride, and I am for that, too, as long as it is proper.

Some of you, I think, may be in opposition to this measure. I hope you will not be, but perhaps you just do not understand our problem out there. It is a terrible situation there, by reason of this devastating drought we are going through. The author of this bill is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], one of the soundest and best Members of this Congress, in my judgment, and he has given a lot of thought to it. The great Committee on Agriculture has brought it out.

This is not just a gimmick to give money away, it is a matter to give new life to the soil and the grass that grows on it and to give justice to our people. If you want us to go along with you and support the tariff and other things you may be interested in, we ask your indulgence, for this is a serious situation with us, and we would like for you to help us. When you do, we do not think you are doing any more for us than we are doing for you or are willing to do for you. Let us just be fair. Come on and help us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would be glad to go along with you in preference to going along with these appropriations for other nations, sure, but is there going to be money enough to go around? As I understand, you are bound, or rather, not bound, but you are determined to continue these foreign-aid programs.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman knows that he and I pretty well have agreed on this foreign-aid proposition, as far as I am personally concerned. Some of the other gentlemen do disagree with me on that, and some on the gentleman's side disagree as to that. But that is beside the question here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. MORRIS. This is for our own people at home.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is only so much money. If you keep on giving it abroad you cannot give it to the Texas boys.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman may have a point there, but let us stay with the bill here. Let us give the people out there an opportunity to live, an opportunity to exist. Let us protect our soil and grass by passing this bill. It is a good bill, I think.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add a few words here from a group of people who have no oil wells—they do not have any fish in any ocean—they cannot benefit directly from this bill at the present time—but we are for this legislation. You see, we cannot yet benefit from this legislation in south Missouri because we have a strange kind of drought. It is an unofficial, off-the-record drought without the benefit of Mr. Benson's official blessings. For some strange reason, we have not been declared a disaster area in spite of the fact that of all the States of the Union, we alone match Texas and Oklahoma for the dubious honor of having the worst pasture conditions in America, 26 percent of normal. We rank fourth worst in the Nation in the matter of hay supplies. Our hay production this year was 72 percent to 80 percent of normal at the outset and it is now almost totally exhausted by an unusually long feeding period that started as early as July and August of this year. Other States with pasture conditions 60 percent of normal and hay supplies 151 percent of normal are receiving disaster aid from the Federal Government. But the Secretary of Agriculture steadfastly refuses to declare southwest Missouri a disaster area. Nevertheless we will not be dogs in the manger. We are for good legislation which is good for America, and we are neither surprised nor impressed to hear that the Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to this bill. It is not the first time that he has tried to thwart the will of the Congress, and I suspect it will not be the last. For instance, it might have escaped your notice, but here is an excellent example. Public Law 875, which was passed by the 81st Congress, specifically states that “the President through the Secretary of Agriculture shall furnish to established farmers, ranchers, and stockmen feed for livestock”—and get this—“and seed for planting.”

The sad truth is that in spite of the fact that the language is clear, the Secretary of Agriculture has never provided any seed to any drought disaster areas. Not one dime of additional money has ever been allocated through the ACP to counties suffering from drought so that farmers might reseed their ravaged pastures. The excuse is that the Government has no stockpile of surplus seed. But, I submit that excuse is too thin to pour. The Government owns no Commodity Credit Corporation surplus of hay either, but it has and is providing hay in many drought-stricken States. The mere fact that the Government has



no surplus seed should not preclude the benefit that was intended by the Congress. One of the most important needs in any disaster area is to get some grass or permanent pasture back on the fields. That was the intent of Congress or it would never have so stated in Public Law 875. But, because Mr. Benson has no surplus seed, the will of the Congress is thwarted. I quote from a conversation that I had just this morning with one Mr. Fred G. Ritchie of the Agricultural Conservation Service Program who said:

The only additional funds that have been allocated over and above the regular conservation program has been for wind erosion and flood damage area. The department has not allocated additional funds under ACSF for drought practices.

So you see while it is on the books, while it is definitely the will of Congress, we apparently have not spelled it out sufficiently for the Secretary of Agriculture. Congress has tried. We have told them they should provide seed for reseeding. In fact, just yesterday we voted the money for it.

May I quote from page 3 under the "Disaster-loan revolving fund," which we voted yesterday as a deficiency appropriation, "\$15 million that may be used for emergency feed and seed assistance." Note the word "seed" appears again in our drought legislation.

We want it done. We have appropriated the money, but the Department of Agriculture refuses to do it.

I had hoped to present an amendment to this legislation today which will direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal aid for the reseeding of permanent pasture. But after talking with the Committee on Agriculture I believe it would be better to present a special bill—which I will do at an early date—a bill which will spell out in no uncertain terms that the will of Congress is that the Government is to provide specific aid in the reseeding of permanent pasture and other vegetation in drought-stricken areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. McCormack, the time of Mr. BROWN of Missouri was extended 5 minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Thank you very much.

I will present that bill, and I hope the Committee on Agriculture will give it prompt action, because it is already the specific will of Congress and has been so stated many times.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas whom we respect as a learned friend of agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. The committee will be glad to have the gentleman's bill.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Thank you very much.

I want to say a word about deferred grazing. Every person in this room is vitally concerned with the goal that will be accomplished by this measure and subsequent measures of drought assistance.

There can be pros and cons on whether a government has certain responsibilities in time of emergency to aid in the development of the sands of Arabia or Pakistan. There can be pros and cons on government's right to assume other responsibilities now taken for granted by governments all over the world.

But here we are talking about a time-honored government responsibility that is as old as government itself. Historically, even among the least civilized tribes, governments have come to the aid of their unfortunate citizens who suffer an act-of-God disaster.

And I do not care how modern we have become, or how much our concepts have changed. If this Government has so many commitments that it cannot extend a helping hand to those who are stricken by disaster, this Government has too many commitments.

But even more important than the good-neighbor principle involved in this legislation, let me point out to you that everyone in this hall can vote for this bill out of sheer selfishness, if need be.

Everyone—in every congressional district—eats food; and every housewife I have ever seen is vitally interested in the lowest possible grocery bill every month. Now, this legislation deals with the vital source of both.

We are talking about the heart of the modern diet and the heart of economical grocery bills; because we are talking about protecting the most economical source of meat and milk. That is what we are eating in the 20th century. Not homemade bread or biscuits or lard anymore. We are eating meat, milk, and eggs.

And if we are to assure ourselves ever-increasing supplies of beef and milk; if the housewife is to continue to buy these supplies at the most economical price—we must protect nature's own way of producing meat and milk. We must keep grass on the grass farms of America. For to replace nature's grass with man-grown and harvested roughage is to increase every grocery bill in America.

The blue-stem plains of Oklahoma, Texas, and the West—and the woodland pastures of southwest Missouri—have been ravaged by an undramatic but horrible disaster. Not just one drought. Not just two. But 4 and 5 in a row.

America cannot afford to lose the meat and milk production of this area. For this is the source of economical production.

The bottom farms of the creek valleys and the deltas—the irrigated farms of the great reclamation areas—can produce crops more economically than the plains or upland farms. But no one, and Mr. Chairman, I mean no one, can produce meat and milk more economically than our grass farmers, who farm the low-priced thin land of America.

You cannot graze cattle or milk cows on \$300 an acre land, unless you want to pay \$3 a pound for a porterhouse steak and 50 cents a quart for milk. We must protect nature's grass.

After continuous droughts, our grass-farms are going. Some are as bare as this tabletop. Our farmers have seeded and reseeded, straining their pocket-

books and their credit, hoping against hope that next year the rains will come. But the rains have not come; and our farmers cannot dig into their jeans for another gamble.

The only way that we, as Americans, can keep grass on the grass farms is for all of us, through our Government, to make it economically feasible for the owner or renter to defer grazing and reseed his parched fields. That is what this legislation is designed to do.

Now this bill as it stands is directed primarily toward ranching; and this is just the first of many drought measures. Other will be brought forth which will mean more specific benefits for the small farmer who produces meat and milk.

But the principle of deferred grazing is sound. It is no money-making gimmick. By the time the Department of Agriculture carves this thing up to fit the money, the deferred-grazing payments will scarcely be enough to replace the income the ranchers could have gained by keeping cattle on even the ravaged acres.

But it will offer the farmer who looks toward the future some economic justification for sacrificing today's "bird in the hand" for tomorrow's "two in the bush." He will not make any money out of the deal. But if it is properly administered, maybe he will not lose too much; and the Nation will gain the replenishment of land at the very time the land needs it most—immediately after a serious drought.

This one piece of grass-farming legislation is small, indeed, compared to the Government programs for crop farming, especially when you consider that livestock products contribute 55 percent of our total gross agricultural product of the Nation.

The money involved is mere pocket change compared to the costly soil bank.

And few, if any, grass farmers can qualify for soil bank payments. You have to have a base acreage allotment to qualify for soil-bank acreage reserve program. And, even in the conservation reserve, only those acres that have been devoted to soil-depleting crops can be included.

All the grass farmers are asking here is deferred grazing for a minimum of 1 year and a maximum of 3 years and only for those areas that have suffered a major disaster.

This legislation is sound. It is sorely needed to insure the continuing supply of vital portions of our daily diet both in the immediate and long-range future. It strives to protect the most economical source of that production: Nature's way, the grass.

The people of south Missouri who have suffered 5 long years of drought and its accompanying disasters—who are even now in the midst of a major disaster, albeit an off-the-record one without benefit of Benson recognition—are proud to join in urging the passage of this bill.

Even if we never get to participate in the program, deferred grazing is good for America.



(Mr. BROWN of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only 1 minute, simply to clarify the record on 2 or 3 points that have been raised. First: This drought is no respecter of State lines or of county lines. Some 600 counties in the United States are now officially identified by the Secretary of Agriculture as being of disaster proportions. That is one-fifth of all the counties in the United States. It goes all the way from the Mexican border almost to the Canadian border; so it is a nationwide problem to which this bill would apply. The United States Weather Bureau and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey have described the drought conditions as the worst that has beset this country in more than 300 years. It is so serious in its extent that it has been played up in front-page feature stories in practically every national magazine in the country during the last 6 months. Not only that, it was so serious it caused the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior in their solicitude for the plight of the people in this area and the land that is going to ruin, to go there recently and spend 3 days studying the problem and inspecting the actual area involved. I was present when the President came to my home county in San Angelo, Tex. There he was told by the best authorities in America—not some local man but by the best authorities in America—speaking from the scientific standpoint, from what has been learned in colleges and in connection with the soil-conservation program generally, in a very well-prepared brief that one of the best remedies to apply to this situation is the very provision set up and authorized in this legislation. So I think it is a sound program. This is not a relief measure for any individual or for any particular group. It is a relief measure for the soil of America in order to get it back to normal productive capacity so that some people, among the most stable people in the whole country, will be able to pay their taxes and get back to a normal life once it starts raining again. That is what this bill is for. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture, after careful study and consideration. Every practical soil conservationist in the country is for it.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, the seriousness of the drought situation as it affects my district and the entire drought area and Nation cannot be overemphasized.

As I have stated before, the people in southwest Kansas are not in a state of panic about the future of their farm communities, because they know that their area is subject to weather cycles of several years of dry weather, followed by several years of adequate rainfall. They know that things will get better. How-

ever, the severity and length of the present shortage of moisture at a time when farmers have faced rising costs and sliding-scale prices has created an immediate situation that concerns the whole Nation and which I would term a national emergency. Of course, we are concerned as a Nation when those who provide the major portions of our bread and meat are not rewarded in income for their lifelong services because of a catastrophe of nature and lower parity prices. But we are also deeply concerned about what may happen to that great natural resource—our native pastureland—in a time of unparalleled drought. Already much grass has been overpastured and is in danger of being lost. Re-seeding in these areas is expensive and often impractical. The bill to establish a deferred grazing program is aimed at making it possible for ranchers to rest these now marginal pastures. Such a practice would help to sustain the present stands of grass and allow it to seed and thicken while farmer-ranchers receive a nominal fee from the Government equal to prevailing rental rates as a temporary measure. If the pastures need to be rested some will wonder why the farmer or rancher does not do this on his own initiative. Many are doing this already. Others, destitute for immediate income, are continuing to pasture, with the hope that rain will be immediately forthcoming and the knowledge that this is their only possibility for any sort of income. This program will be the farthest thing from a plumb for its recipients. The payments will be nominal, and the maximum to any one operator is set at \$5,000.

To summarize, this bill, if passed, will serve three purposes. First, it will furnish some of temporary monetary assistance to the drought-stricken areas. Second, it will encourage the kind of protection for one of our great natural resources that individuals in many cases will be unable to provide. Third, deferred grazing practices will make possible increased cover on pasturelands which may avert tremendous wind erosion problems that may otherwise result if the drought continues another year.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors. No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred grazing is for a period of less than 12 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed \$5,000 for any 1 year.

SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized

herein for any county shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program concurrently.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress (act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State extension service which, with other feed available will provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in performing such functions."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 14, strike out all of section 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 147, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.



The question was taken; and there were—yeas 270, nays 108, answered “present” 2, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—270

Abbitt	Fenton	Moss
Abernethy	Fisher	Multer
Adair	Flood	Murray
Addonizio	Forand	Natcher
Albert	Forrester	Nimtz
Alexander	Fountain	Norblad
Alger	Frazier	Norrell
Allen, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	O'Brien, Ill.
Andersen,	Friedel	O'Brien, N. Y.
H. Carl	Garmatz	O'Hara, Ill.
Anderson,	Gathings	O'Hara, Minn.
Mont.	Gavin	Osmers
Andresen,	George	Passman
August H.	Granahan	Patman
Andrews	Grant	Patterson
Anfuso	Gray	Pfost
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Pillion
Ashmore	Gregory	Poage
Aspinall	Griffiths	Polk
Avery	Gross	Powell
Ayres	Hale	Preston
Bailey	Harden	Price
Baldwin	Hardy	Rabaut
Barden	Harris	Rains
Baring	Harrison, Nebr.	Reece, Tenn.
Bass, Tenn.	Harrison, Va.	Rees, Kans.
Beamer	Harvey	Reuss
Beckworth	Hays, Ohio	Rhodes, Ariz.
Belcher	Healey	Rhodes, Pa.
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Riley
Berry	Hemphill	Rivers
Blatnik	Herlong	Roberts
Blitch	Hill	Robeson, Va.
Boggs	Hoeven	Robison, Ky.
Bolling	Holifield	Rodino
Bonner	Holmes	Rogers, Colo.
Boykin	Holtzman	Rogers, Fla.
Boyle	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Bray	Huddleston	Rogers, Tex.
Breeding	Hull	Rooney
Brooks, La.	Ikard	Roosevelt
Brooks, Tex.	Jenkins	Rutherford
Brown, Ga.	Jennings	Santangelo
Brown, Mo.	Jensen	Saund
Burdick	Johnson	Saylor
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Schwengel
Byrd	Jones, Mo.	Scrivner
Byrne, Pa.	Judd	Selden
Cannon	Karsten	Shelley
Carnahan	Kearns	Sheppard
Carrigg	Kee	Shuford
Celler	Kelley, Pa.	Sieminski
Chelf	Keogh	Sikes
Chenoweth	Kilday	Siler
Chiperfield	Kilgore	Simpson, Ill.
Christopher	King	Simpson, Pa.
Chudoff	Kirwan	Sisk
Clark	Kitchin	Smith, Kans.
Coad	Knutson	Smith, Miss.
Coffin	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Lane	Spence
Cooper	Lanham	Springer
Corbett	Lankford	Staggers
Cunningham,	LeCompte	Sullivan
Iowa	Lennon	Talle
Cunningham,	Long	Teague, Tex.
Nebr.	Loser	Thomas
Curtis, Mo.	McCarthy	Thompson, La.
Dague	McCormack	Thompson, N. J.
Davis, Ga.	McFall	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	McGovern	Thomson, Wyo.
Dawson, Ill.	McIntire	Tollefson
Dawson, Utah	McIntosh	Trimble
Delaney	McMillan	Tuck
Dempsey	McVey	Udall
Denton	Macdonald	Ullman
Diggs	Mack, Ill.	Van Zandt
Dingell	Mack, Wash.	Vinson
Dixon	Madden	Walter
Dollinger	Magnuson	Watts
Dooley	Mahon	Weaver
Dorn, S. C.	Matthews	Whitener
Dowdy	Merrow	Widnall
Durham	Metcalfe	Williams, Miss.
Edmondson	Michel	Willis
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
Engle	Miller, Md.	Withrow
Evins	Miller, Nebr.	Wright
Fallon	Miller, N. Y.	Wright
Farbstein	Mills	Young
Fascell	Morgan	Zelenko
Feighan	Morris	

NAYS—108

Allen, Calif.	Baumhart	Betts
Auchincloss	Becker	Boland
Bass, N. H.	Bennett, Mich.	Bolton
Bates	Bentley	Bosch

Bow	Hess
Broomfield	Hiestand
Brown, Ohio	Hillings
Broyhill	Hoffman
Budge	Holt
Bush	Hosmer
Byrne, Ill.	James
Byrnes, Wis.	Johansen
Canfield	Kean
Cederberg	Kearney
Chamberlain	Keeney
Church	Kilburn
Cleveland	Kluczynski
Collier	Knox
Coudert	Laird
Cretella	Latham
Curtin	Lipscomb
Curtis, Mass.	McConnell
Dellay	McCulloch
Dennison	McDonough
Derounian	McGregor
Devereux	Mailliard
Dorn, N. Y.	Marshall
Dwyer	Martin
Fino	Mason
Fogarty	May
Ford	Minshall
Griffin	Moore
Gubser	Mumma
Haskell	Neal
Henderson	Nicholson
Heslton	O'Konski

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Machrowicz	O'Neill
------------	---------

NOT VOTING—52

Arends	Gwinn	Perkins
Baker	Hagen	Philbin
Barrett	Haley	Pilcher
Bowler	Halleck	Porter
Brownson	Hays, Ark.	Radwin
Buckley	Holland	Riehlman
Cole	Hyde	Scott, N. C.
Cooley	Jackson	Scott, Pa.
Cramer	Jarman	Steed
Dies	Jonas	Taber
Donohue	Keating	Teller
Doyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Thornberry
Eberharter	Krueger	Vorys
Flynt	Lesinski	Wainwright
Fulton	Meador	Williams, N. Y.
Gary	Morano	Wilson, Ind.
Gordon	Morrison	
Green, Pa.	Moulder	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. O'Neill against.  
Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Gary with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Morano.  
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Cole.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Vorys.  
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Taber.  
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Riehlman.  
Mr. Haley with Mr. Brownson.  
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Keating.  
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Baker.  
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Jonas.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.  
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Fulton.  
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Radwan.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cramer.  
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Meador.  
Mr. Teller with Mr. Hyde.  
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Jackson.  
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Krueger.  
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Wainwright.  
Mr. Hagen with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on this bill I voted “No.” I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JARMAN. Were he present he would have voted “Aye.” I withdraw my vote and answer “Present.”

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from

Oklahoma, Mr. STEED. I voted “No.” If present Mr. STEED would have voted “Aye.” I withdraw my vote and answer “Present.”

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes.”

## BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3845) extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted etc.,* That section 4 of the joint resolution entitled “Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area,” approved June 16, 1955 (69 Stat. 136), is amended by striking out “2 years” and inserting in lieu thereof “3 years.”

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DEWEY SHORT

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my honor—and I use the word advisedly—to be mentioned briefly in the most widely syndicated and most widely read column in the country, in connection with remarks made in introducing my colleague Hon. CHARLES H. BROWN to the Democratic caucus.

It is the custom in the caucus at the beginning of a new Congress to call the roll of States and the dean of each delegation presents any new Members from their respective States. In conformity with this happy custom I made a few well-chosen remarks in introducing Congressman Brown which were reported in this particular column. Now I would positively not presume to question any statement made in this column. Far from it. It is an American institution—an integral part of the unwritten constitution of the Nation and it keeps more people in order than the FBI and all the United States marshals combined.

But in hearsay reports there inevitably creep in elisions, substitutions, and interpolations which sometimes leave a confused impression.

On that basis, may I say—and I call my colleagues of the caucus to witness—that neither on that occasion nor any



other occasion of my life have I ever said anything that in any way reflected on my friend Dewey Short. I alluded to the hard fought campaign waged on the issues in every precinct, at every schoolhouse, and every crossroads in the congressional district but never in any way did I reflect on the high character and distinguished service of the man who has represented that district so many years in this House. I did pay tribute to the extraordinary man who, against impossible handicaps and incredible odds, defeated him in a district which went 30,000 for Eisenhower, but nothing was said derogatory to the man who has served in this House with such honor to himself and his party, my friend, and your friend, Dewey Short.

#### THE U. S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an article published in the U. S. News & World Report under date of August 3, 1956, should compel all Members of the House to do some real thinking. This article lists how people have prospered in 17 boom years after allowing for taxes and changes in the value of the dollar. Thirty-five groups of people are listed, the highest percentage increase in real income was 107 percent. I was shocked to see how little prosperity our Federal Government workers have secured. Out of 35 groups they were 34th with a percentage of only 14 percent. We have been mighty slow in voting pay increases for postal and Federal workers, and when the legislation is finally passed the amount is greatly watered down. Postal and Federal employees have lagged behind in the improved American standard of living. Their increases are much less than the increases secured by practically everyone else in the American economic scene. The postal employee job because of its low wage scale has become most unattractive. Local postal officials are hard put in securing competent help and are complaining of the difficulties that they meet with in getting people to work at the low entrance salary of \$3,660 per year. The service is suffering. The turnover in large offices such as Detroit, Mich., is as high as 33 1/3 percent. The low-pay policy of the Post Office Department is costly to the Government of the United States. The better people are trained and leave as rapidly as they are trained. The result—a most costly operation and poor service.

Sixty percent of all American families today own their own homes, yet there are many instances on record where letter carriers have been turned down for G. I. loans because their earning power was not sufficient to assure repayment. Are we going to condemn our postal employees to a state of peonage? Are we going to keep them at a submerged economic level, where they have no hope of becoming homeowners? What are we going to do about it?

According to the public press, the Honorable Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, suggests

a study. By the time such a study would be concluded, we would have no postal employees left. I know of no way of making a bad situation worse. I suggest to our colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that they start immediate hearings, keep the hearings short, and report out one of the pay bills now before the committee so that we can speed its enactment into law.

#### THE TRAGEDY IN SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA AND WEST VIRGINIA

(Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of a tragedy that has come to the coal-producing area of southwest Virginia and neighboring West Virginia.

At approximately 1:55 a. m. on Monday of this week, shortly after the midnight shift had started work in the Bishop, Va., coal mine of the Pocahontas Fuel Co., an explosion occurred that killed 37 of the men working in that section of the mine. The remainder of the some 180 workers on the midnight shift escaped, and, displaying the courage that is typical of the men who face daily dangers in producing our coal, many returned to the mine to assist in the rescue and recovery operation that was launched.

The effects of this explosion, apparently caused by gas in the mine, will undoubtedly be long felt and long remembered in the coalfields surrounding the Bishop mine. The explosion has been etched in the faces and the minds of the surviving workers; the dependents of those who died have encountered a great personal loss in the deaths of their husbands, fathers, and sons. Approximately 154 dependents will experience the need that comes from such tragedy. Fortunately, they will receive assistance from the United Mine Workers' health and welfare fund and from the social-security program. And, in the highest traditions of the people who reside and work in our coalfields, aid and comfort will come from friends and neighbors.

I have expressed my deep sympathy to the families of the 37 who died in the early hours of Monday. I know that each Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, is interested and concerned over this tragedy.

Soon after the news of the Bishop explosion became known, I was in contact with the Director of the Bureau of Mines, expressing interest in the rescue operation and the investigation of the cause. The Director and his assistant for health and safety flew to Bishop to join field representatives on the scene and to take charge of the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues will be fully apprised of the explosion, I include as part of my remarks a newspaper account from the Washington Post and Times Herald, an editorial from the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier, an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, and a newspaper listing of the mine disasters in the State of Virginia since 1839.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has often

expressed concern over the need for safety practices and programs in our coal industry. The various legislative actions over the years were culminated by the passage of the Federal Mine Safety Act of 1952; a health and safety program is an integral and important part of the Bureau of Mines; the United Mine Workers and the coal industry in general are encouraging and conducting safety programs; the various States have their individual agencies for coal-mine inspection and enforcement of safety regulations. However, the explosion of Monday—the worst mine disaster since 1951—and the deaths of 443 workers in the mines in 1956, clearly illustrate the need to improve and expand safety regulations and programs.

I would like to mention here the contribution of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., who authored the changes in the mine safety law in 1952. These changes put real teeth in this law, which was passed with bipartisan support in the Congress. It has served to improve safety conditions in our mines and has undoubtedly been responsible for the decline in deaths and injuries.

However, there is room for improvement in the Mine Safety Act. I am issuing invitations to the interested parties, especially the coal associations, the United Mine Workers, the Bureau of Mines, and the Coal Research Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to advise me of their recommendations for changes. I intend to give study to possible additional legislative action to improve this law.

The February 1 issue of the United Mine Workers Journal devoted a portion of its issue to a summary of the mining deaths and injuries in 1956. I include as part of my remarks a table from the Journal, showing the fatality cause for 1956 and 1955:

*Fatality causes—1956 and 1955 compared*

	Bituminous fatalities		Pennsylvania anthracite fatalities		Total fatalities	
	1956	1955	1956	1955	1956	1955
Underground:						
Falls of roof or face	213	194	31	34	244	228
Haulage	71	60	6	6	77	66
Gas or dust explosions:						
Local	5	2	4	2	9	4
Major						
Explosives	8	10	1	2	9	12
Electricity	13	15	2		15	15
Machinery	17	14			17	14
Mine fires	2				2	
All other	11	5	4	5	15	10
Total underground	346	300	48	49	388	349
Surface:						
Haulage	11	17	1	2	12	19
Electricity	4	5		1	4	6
Machinery	5	5	1		6	5
All other	3	6	2	5	5	11
Total surface	23	33	4	8	27	14
Strip mines:						
Haulage	9	7	1		10	7
Electricity	2				2	
Machinery	2	9	1	2	3	11
All other	12	8	1	1	13	9
Total strip	25	24	3	3	28	27
Grand total	388	357	55	60	443	417







85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2367

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 7, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

## AN ACT

To establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-  
4       tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by  
5       the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-  
6       ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as  
7       amended, the President is authorized and directed as part  
8       of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate  
9       and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of  
10      Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
11      affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to

1 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
2 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
3 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
4 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
5 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
6 to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain avail-  
7 able for a period of not less than three years after the  
8 termination of such county as a major disaster area.

9       SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for  
10 deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or  
11 rates not less than the average annual rental value of  
12 grazing land in the county as will induce sufficient partici-  
13 pation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into  
14 consideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds  
15 available for carrying out the program, and any other  
16 relevant factors. No payment shall be made under the  
17 program if the deferred grazing is for a period of less than  
18 twelve consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift  
19 of livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the  
20 farm or ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas.  
21 Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any  
22 one county shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

23       SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such  
24 terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically pro-  
25 vided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate

1 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
2 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
3 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
4 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
5 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
6 this and any other program concurrently.

7 SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
8 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated  
9 for the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress,  
10 such funds as are necessary to carry out the program  
11 authorized herein.

Passed the House of Representatives February 6, 1957.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*



87th CONGRESS  
1st Session

# H. R. 2367

## AN ACT

To establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 7, 1957

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry







3/4/57

19. MONOPOLY. Ordered printed a report on "Antitrust and Monopoly," from the Judiciary Committee (S. Rept. 128). p. 2614  
Ordered printed a report on "Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions," from the Judiciary Committee (S. Rept. 132). p. 2614
20. DROUGHT RELIEF. Sen. Johnson urged passage of S. 511, to establish a deferred grazing program, and pointed out that general rains in Texas have not solved the drought problem. pp. 2625-6
21. FOREIGN OPERATIONS. Agreed to S. Res. 107, to authorize printing of a report on overseas operations of the U. S. Government. p. 2626
22. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Wiley inserted part of the annual report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation for 1956. pp. 2626-8
23. MIDDLE EAST. Continued debate on S. J. Res. 19, to promote peace and stability in the Middle East. pp. 2648-53, 2655-88
24. CORN. Sen. Thye urged passage of S. 1449, to provide that the minimum allotment for corn be 51 million acres, and inserted his letter to the Secretary on Feb. 28 asking that the sign-up date for corn producers be extended. Sen. Carlson agreed. pp. 2653-4
25. EDUCATION. Sen. Kefauver congratulated the winners of 4-H competitions. p. 2654
26. FARM LEADER. Sen. Neuberger eulogized the late State Rep. Irvin Mann of Ore., a leading livestock farmer, and inserted an editorial in tribute to his accomplishments as a farmer and legislator. pp. 2654-5
27. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Malone criticized the proposal that the U. S. join the Organization for Trade Cooperation, and urged greater tariff protection for American industries. pp. 2665-70

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

28. ROADS. Sen. Gore inserted his recent address before the National Crushed Limestone Institute discussing the over-all highway program. pp. A1663-4
29. STATEHOOD. Sen. Smathers inserted a newspaper article, "The Game of Politics--Stumbling Block to Hawaii Statehood." p. A1666  
Del. Burns stated that there is increased national sentiment for Hawaii statehood and inserted several editorials in support of these sentiments. pp. A1673-4  
Rep. Doyle inserted a Western States Conference of Democrats resolution endorsing Alaska-Hawaii statehood. p. A1717
30. CIVIL DEFENSE. Rep. Zablocki commended and inserted an article written by Val Peterson stating that "only by working together can we bring civil defense to all our people." pp. A1672-3
31. CONSERVATION. Sen. Neuberger inserted John B. Oakes', conservation editor of the New York Times, editorial, "Conservation: Danger Ahead--Wilderness Resources are Menaced in Several Areas." pp. A1680-1  
Rep. Metcalf inserted 3 resolutions adopted by the Council of the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago urging positive action toward the development of the resources on Indian reservations. pp. A1708-9

Rep. Metcalf inserted Dr. Ira N. Barielson's recent address summarizing the conservation successes and failures of this past year and listing some of the goals of this year. pp. A1711-2

32. EXTENSION WORK. Rep. Van Zandt inserted a compilation revealing the many Federal programs for the aging and how these programs are being coordinated under the President's Federal Council on Aging, including Extension Service programs and the special farm family program which has been under way for some time. pp. A1681-6
33. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Rep. St. George inserted a Farm Journal article, "We're Over the Surplus Hump and Here's Why," and stated it gives us a more encouraging picture of the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities. pp. A1690-1
34. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Udall stated that "certainly there is evidence at hand that the time has come when we must reformulate and restate the basic premise of our security-through-aid programs" and inserted a Harper's Magazine article contributing to this discussion. pp. A1691-4
35. BUDGET; EXPENDITURES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Scherer stating that "there has been a revolt in this country against the ever-increasing cost of Government--a revolution that is certainly justified and long overdue," and inserted a newspaper article on this subject. p. A1694
36. SOIL BANK. Rep. Breeding inserted a constituent's letter and several petitions claiming that "landlords are taking the land from small tenant farmers so they can collect the soil-bank payments," and stating that they feel an injustice is being done the small farmers. p. A1714
37. CORN. Rep. Hoeven inserted a newspaper article, "Politics Dominate Corn Bill." p. A1708
38. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Roosevelt inserted a report of a panel chaired by Rep. Patman, meeting at the Western Democratic Conference, dealing with the tight money squeeze and urging passage of H. Res. 85, to provide for a full investigation of national monetary and credit policies by the House Banking and Currency Committee. pp. A1695-6
39. FARM ECONOMY. Rep. Coad inserted an article by Carl Wilken which asserted that industrial America exploited rural America by underpaying it and urging support for submarginal farm operations. pp. A1697-8
40. POULTRY. Rep. Sullivan inserted the testimony of Miss Loretta Johnson of the St. Louis Consumer Federation before the Senate Agriculture Committee, urging compulsory poultry inspection. p. A1698
41. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Hosmer inserted an editorial favoring Interior Secretary Seaton's proposal for a power partnership at the Trinity River project. pp. A1698-9  
Rep. Avery inserted an editorial citing the private dam-building program in the Pacific Northwest as proof that public power projects were not the only solution to power shortages. p. A1701
42. PERSONNEL. Rep. Bass inserted an article criticizing the Administration for partisan appointments and increases in the amount and cost of top-policy positions. p. A1699



That is when one really comes to appreciate a man. I wish I had time to explain how many of the truly great Presidents of the United States have been fishermen. Incidentally, Grover Cleveland, a great Democratic President, said, "The James River—" which is in my county—"is the finest small mouth bass stream in the United States." That was before the days of river pollution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia.

I now yield to the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am happy that our distinguished majority leader, ever thoughtful and ever considerate, has brought to the attention of the Senate this anniversary date, a date which marks such a milestone in the life of our friend, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN.

I had the pleasure and great privilege of serving in the House of Representatives with SAM RAYBURN. I served under him when he was Democratic leader in the House of Representatives. I wish to pay my tribute to him—to his integrity, his wisdom, his devotion to our country, and his outstanding leadership. He is indeed a great Speaker and a magnificent American, and I am proud to have the opportunity to stand here today and pay my tribute to him and to his great State of Texas, which have given us not only the great Speaker of the House of Representatives, but our able and distinguished majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend from Alabama.

I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to join in tribute to SAM RAYBURN. I have never had the honor of serving with SAM RAYBURN, but I have known him for many years. He is an outstanding American, and all of us have a right to be very proud of his accomplishments.

While I am on my feet, I wish heartily to endorse what the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] said about SAM RAYBURN on last Saturday. In my opinion, SAM RAYBURN is one of the great men this Nation has produced. He has done much to develop the things which have made America really great.

I should also like to note what the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] said about Grover Cleveland. I am a staunch Republican, but I think Grover Cleveland was one of the truly great Presidents of the United States. At a time when it required real courage to advocate the gold standard, Grover Cleveland took such a stand. The only foolproof currency is that founded on the gold standard.

I wish to thank the majority leader for bringing to our attention SAM RAYBURN, and also Sam Houston.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

I now yield to the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I consider it a privilege to associate myself with the many Senators who are at this time paying tribute to the Speaker of the House, the incomparable SAM RAYBURN. I doubt if, in a review of history, one could find any man who in the past half century has had such a great impact on the legislative well-being of these United States. I doubt if we could find any man who, in the past four decades, has contributed more to the progress of the United States than has SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Like several other Senators, it was also my high privilege to serve in the House of Representatives under Mr. SAM. That was one of the great and valuable experiences of my life, one which I shall always appreciate, and one which I shall never forget. No man can be closely associated with SAM RAYBURN and not detect in him that spark of greatness, and that purity of patriotism which is his. He is, indeed, a great man.

I wish to join with other Senators in congratulating the State of Texas for sending a man to the Congress who is capable of making such a great contribution not only to the United States but to the world as well.

The State of Texas seems always to produce just about the very best. Our distinguished majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, is cut from the same cloth as SAM RAYBURN. While he has not been here for so long a time as has Mr. RAYBURN, he is nevertheless demonstrating the same high quality of leadership and making the same valuable type of contribution to his country SAM RAYBURN has made.

Mr. President, there is nothing I can add to the luster of SAM RAYBURN's name, but he has honored us all, by allowing us a chance to know him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate very much my friend's generous references.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I, too, should like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made here today about the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN, and the wonderful contribution he has made to our country. He has honored the State of Texas, as has our own majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, by his able and brilliant leadership in this body.

I had the privilege and the high honor to serve under SAM RAYBURN's leadership for six terms in the House of Representatives. Next to the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], he has served longer in the Congress than has any other individual. I believe the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona is ahead of him by approximately 8 months.

In my association with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I always found that in every great crisis and every great emergency, his country came first. This was true, whether it was under the leadership of a President of his own

party, or under the leadership of the man who now occupies the White House. At no time did I ever find the Speaker of the House of Representatives engaged in smalltime, petty, partisan politics. The impact and impression he has made on our country have inured to the benefit of both great political parties. The country and the world are the better because of the tremendous contributions he has made to our country during his long service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend from Florida.

I now yield to my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and to say a few words with reference to my good and great friend, "Mr. SAM," Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I have never served in Congress with the distinguished Speaker, as has been the privilege of several of my colleagues in the Senate. But I am a fellow Texan, and I have felt the effect and benefit of his masterful hand when it came to representing the people and interests of Texas and the people and interests of America.

I have never seen him take a stand for or lend his influence to any effort that was not worthwhile and outstanding, judged on its own merits. If there be one instance in which his judgment might well be justified, I believe it is in the person and in the record of our distinguished majority leader. He, too, has made a record for himself in Texas, and I am sure elsewhere also, of which we are very proud.

I should like to associate myself also with those who have indicated their pleasure at the privilege of acquaintance with the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, the President pro tempore of the Senate, who very modestly declined to be recognized on the occasion of his great anniversary of service to our country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friends for their kind statements with regard to me and our beloved Speaker of the House.

#### THE RAINS IN TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, although there have been general rains in Texas within the past 2 weeks, I should like to point out that the problems growing out of 7 years or more of drought have not been instantly solved.

As a matter of fact, there is one problem in particular that becomes more urgent by reason of the rains. I refer to the matter of giving the range pastures, worn down by the long drought, a chance to recover their productivity.

The rain that has come—although much more is needed—will cause some grass to grow. It will not be the abundant crop we have known in the past. Perhaps it will be no more than a green fuzz on the surface of the earth.

Nevertheless, it will offer a strong temptation to our stockmen, who have



seen no grass at all for so long a time, to turn their livestock into the pastures.

Mr. President, it is very important that this be avoided. These pastures should be allowed to reseed themselves during the next several years. Otherwise, they are not going to be as productive as in the past. And their full potential productivity will be needed in the years ahead if our livestock industry is to make a comeback from the disaster of the dry years.

A bill I introduced in the Senate, S. 511, would establish a deferred grazing program that would make it economically feasible for the hard-pressed stockmen to keep their livestock off these pastures during this crucial period.

Mr. President, it is my hope that hearings on S. 511 will be held soon by the Committee on Agriculture and that it will be reported to the Senate for action.

#### PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF REPORT ON OVERSEAS OPERATIONS OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on last Friday I submitted Senate Resolution 107, to authorize printing as a Senate document the report on overseas operations of the United States Government. I have consulted with the majority leader and with the minority leader, and they have no objection to my calling up the resolution at this time.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of the resolution, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, Mr. President, we frequently follow the procedure of immediately acting on resolutions of this kind when they are submitted. In view of the fact that such a request was not made when it was submitted, I believe the Senator from Louisiana is justified in asking that the Senate follow the customary procedure with respect to resolutions of this kind. Therefore, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 107) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document the report on Overseas Operation of the United States Government, by Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator from the State of Louisiana, submitted to the Committee on Appropriations under date of February 1, 1957; and that 2,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate recesses today, it stand in recess until 11 a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair) Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to note an announcement from Mr. Lewis G. Castle, Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation, that he and his associates will meet with representatives of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, including the Honorable Lionel Chevrier, president of the Authority, the coming Thursday and Friday, March 7 and 8. I am sure that this conference will be most significant to our two nations in terms of continuing progress on the dual-nation project.

In this connection, I have in my hands the text of the annual report of our own Seaway Corporation for the calendar year ending December 31, 1956. This report, as previously filed with the Senate and House of Representatives, is, I believe, of deep interest to the Nation and, of course, in particular, to us of the Great Lakes region.

I send to the desk the introduction to the report and several of the initial pages describing the progress to date on the project, which is, of course, proceeding in accordance with the Wiley-Dondero law, Public Law 358, of the 84th Congress. I append to the text the release of the Seaway Corporation describing the United States-Canada meeting later this week. I ask that both items be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION FOR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1956

##### INTRODUCTION

Construction of the epochal St. Lawrence seaway, Lake Erie to Montreal, was notably advanced during 1956. With the midpoint of the construction period now reached, all major design and construction activity is essentially on schedule.

Dollar value of awarded contracts aggregates about two-thirds of the estimated total project construction cost. Construction work was generally prosecuted on an around-the-clock basis, 6 days a week during the 1956 season, except for restricted operations in the winter months. Of the 7 new seaway locks in the entire project, the 2 United States locks are programed to go into initial operation in July 1958; 1 Canadian lock is due to be placed in service in April 1958; and all of the new facilities are scheduled to be ready for service by deep-draft vessels with the opening of the 1959 shipping season.

Pursuant to legislation approved by President Eisenhower on May 13, 1954, and prior Canadian legislation effective December 21, 1951, this seaway construction is being accomplished jointly by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, a United States Government corporation, and a similar Canadian entity, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority. This joint venture continues to be conducted on a plane of cooperative understanding.

Broadly, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway system presently provides a 35-foot depth controlling channel depth from the Atlantic to Montreal (1,000 miles); a 14-foot bottleneck depth in the 114-mile St. Lawrence reach from Montreal upstream to Ogdensburg, N. Y.; and essentially a 25-foot controlling depth in the confined channel reaches from Ogdensburg to the head of the Great Lakes (about 1,100 miles).

The seaway-modernization program will increase the controlling channel depth in the upper St. Lawrence River from 14 to 27 feet and in the Welland Canal from 25 to 27 feet. It will reduce the number of 11ft locks to be transited between Lake Erie and Montreal from 25 to 14.

In the upper St. Lawrence there are now 18 locks normally navigated by upbound vessels. Controlling lock dimensions are 252 by 44 by 14 feet. These will be supplanted by 7 new seaways locks, having a controlling clear length of 768 feet, width of 80 feet, and sill depth of 30 feet. In the Welland Canal, connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario, the existing 7 11ft locks (plus 1 guard lock) remain unchanged. They afford similar controlling dimensions.

With these new facilities, modern ocean-going freighters will be able to ply from the seven seas to the numerous ports along the Great Lakes. Also, the eastern frontier of the Great Lakes shipping fleet will be extended from Ogdensburg, N. Y., 600 miles eastward to Seven Islands, Quebec, and to other points in the St. Lawrence Gulf. Through the present 14-foot restricted reach vessels are now generally limited to carrying some 1,500 tons of general cargo and 2,500 tons of bulk commodities, such as iron ore. With the larger ships that can be accommodated in the future, these cargo limits will be raised generally to 8,000 and 20,000 tons, or more, respectively.

In accordance with an act of Congress signed by the President on March 21, 1956, the United States, through the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, has initiated enlargement of the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, from the existing 21- to 25-foot-depth system at low-water datum to at least 27 feet. Major dredging and rock-removal operations are involved in the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, St. Clair River, St. Marys River, and the Straits of Mackinac. This modernization is scheduled for completion in 1962. It will restore the original overall Atlantic Ocean to Lake Superior concept for the seaway and will extend the 27-foot-depth system from Toledo to Chicago, Milwaukee, and Duluth.

In the 46-mile International Rapids section of the upper St. Lawrence River major power development construction is underway jointly by the Power Authority of the State of New York and the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario. This development is advantageous to the creation of the new seaway in this reach. The power entities are planning to create the new power pool in July 1958 and to place initial electrical output on the line in September 1958.

#### Work division, Lake Erie to Montreal seaway

Lake Erie normally stands at 572 feet above sea level and Lake Ontario at 246. The 326-foot head differential is overcome by the 27-mile Welland Canal, which connects the two lakes and bypasses navigation around Niagara Gorge. From Lake Ontario to Montreal the river descends 225 feet. This 182-mile reach is normally divided into the following units:

Thousand Islands section, 68 miles, Lake Ontario to Chimney Point below Ogdensburg, N. Y.

International Rapids section, 46 miles, Chimney Point to St. Regis, Quebec (below Massena, N. Y.).

Canadian section, 68 miles from St. Regis to Montreal, Quebec. This reach includes the Lake St. Francis, Soulanges, and Lachine sections.

Since the boundary between the United States and Canada in this region is contained within the Thousand Islands and International Rapids section of the river, these waters are international.

Following is a breakdown of the principal construction features underway by both countries.







# Daily Digest

## HIGHLIGHTS

House concluded consideration of Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

## Senate

### Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, April 4, at 12 noon.

### Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

#### ~~DESERT LAND ENTRYMEN, AND GRAZING PROGRAM~~

~~Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported without amendment S. 1002, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen, and with an amendment in the nature of a substitute bill, S. 511, to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas.~~

#### APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee concluded hearings on H. R. 5189, fiscal 1958 appropriations for Interior Department, after hearing testimony as follows:

On numerous items in the bill—Senator Watkins;

On overall budget estimates—Under Secretary Hatfield Chilson, D. Otis Beasley, Administrative Assistant Secretary, Felix E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources, Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, and Sidney D. Larson, Director, Division of Budget and Finance, all of Interior Department;

On funds for Office of Minerals Mobilization—Assistant Secretary Felix E. Wormser, and Director Spencer Shannon;

On funds for acquisition of strategic minerals—Assistant Secretary Felix E. Wormser and Clyde Flynn;

On funds for forest fire protection—Senator Kuchel, Keith Klinger, Chief of Los Angeles County Fire Department, Robert Radford, Los Angeles County Watershed Commission, Willis Warner, representing Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, Calif., and Frank R. Jewitt;

On funds for forestry research—Senator Flanders, J. Walter Myers, Jr., and J. V. Whitfield, both of Forest Farmers Association, and James C. Turner, Jr., chief of fire control, Georgia Forestry Commission;

On funds for construction of the DeSoto Bertrand Bend Wildlife Refuge—Representative Jensen, who favored the project, and F. Pace Woods and Henry B. McCampbell, who opposed the project;

On funds for forest fire control research—Vincent J. Schaefer, director of research, Muntalp Foundation; and

On funds for Geological Survey—William Welsh, National Reclamation Association.

#### APPROPRIATIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee began hearings on H. R. 6070, fiscal 1958 appropriations for independent offices, hearing testimony in behalf of funds for their respective departments from the following witnesses: Thomas Coggeshall, Chairman, Renegotiation Board; Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System; John W. Macy, Jr., Executive Director, Civil Service Commission; Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General, GAO; and Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, Chairman, and Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Director, both of National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

#### HOUSING

*Committee on Banking and Currency:* Housing Subcommittee held a hearing to receive the views of Senator Morse, who testified as to the urgent need for an expanded urban renewal program and an expanded public housing program.

Subcommittee adjourned subject to call.

#### D. C. MATTERS

*Committee on the District of Columbia:* Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety unanimously ordered favorably reported to the full committee with amendments S. 1269, relating to condemnation of insanitary buildings in the D. C., and with an amendment S. 1708, relating to children born out of wedlock in D. C.



Prior to this action, hearings were held on these bills as follows: On S. 1269, with favoring testimony from Chester H. Gray, D. C. Corporation Counsel, and James L. Martin, D. C. Finance Officer; and on S. 1708, with favoring testimony from Chester H. Gray, and Joseph B. Irvine, Chief of Vital Statistics Section, Department of Public Health for D. C.

#### D. C. NOMINATION

*Committee on the District of Columbia:* Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the nomination of Orman W. Ketcham to be judge of the D. C. juvenile court.

#### INTEREST RATE ON SAVINGS BONDS

*Committee on Finance:* Committee held hearings on H. R. 5520, to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on U. S. savings bonds, hearing testimony favoring the bill with certain suggested amendments from Under Secretary of the Treasury W. Randolph Burgess; Dr. Seymour Harris, Harvard University; and William A. Heilprin, of Washington, D. C.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

#### COMMITTEE BUSINESS

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the nominations of Francis H. Russell, of Maine, to be Ambassador to New Zealand, and of Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be U. S. representative to 12th session of Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the U. N.; H. Con. Res. 115, favoring Spanish membership in NATO; H. R. 4271, to provide that the Delegate from Alaska may be a member of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Committee; an original bill increasing from 10 to 11 the number of Assistant Secretaries of State Department; and protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (Exec. F, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

#### CIVIL AVIATION

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:* Subcommittee on Aviation continued its hearings on S. 1045, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act by adding thereto new provisions relating to civil aviation medicine, and S. 1474, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to grant permanent certification to all cargo carriers. Witnesses heard were C. N. Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots Association, who testified on both bills, and Joseph M. FitzGerald, Director, Bureau of Air Operations, CAB, and D. W. Rentzel, president, Slick Airways, who directed their remarks to S. 1474.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

#### COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Internal Security Subcommittee heard further testimony from Dr. Vladimir D. Poremsky, president, International Anti-Communist

Organization, who made suggestions as to how the free nations could plan to aid another nation to free itself from Soviet domination. He also stated that Communist activities in South America are directed from Mexico City, and that in Mexico the Soviet has 900 people connected with its Embassy and with its various other official agencies.

#### PRICE DISCRIMINATION

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Anti-trust and Monopoly continued its hearings on S. 11, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act to secure equality of opportunity, hearing testimony from Representative Patman; Edward R. Johnston, American Bar Association; Jack T. Jennings, Cooperative League of the U. S.; and George H. Frates, National Association of Retail Druggists.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

#### FLOOD CONTROL COMPACT

*Committee on Public Works:* Subcommittee on Flood Control—Rivers and Harbors held hearings on S. 1682, granting consent and approval of Congress to the Merrimack River Flood Control Compact, with favoring testimony from Senator Cotton, sponsor of the bill, and Myron Hart, Laconia, N. H., a member of the Connecticut Valley Flood Control Compact Commission.

The full committee will hold an executive session tomorrow to consider this bill and other committee matters.

#### COMMITTEE BUSINESS

*Committee on Rules and Administration:* Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported H. J. Res. 279, authorizing the procurement of an oil portrait and marble bust of the late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson; S. Con. Res. 22, authorizing printing of additional copies of Internal Security Annual Report for 1956; S. Con. Res. 24, authorizing printing of additional copies of Senate Report 139 entitled "Technical Assistance"; with an amendment S. Res. 109, authorizing printing of additional reports by Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency; and an original resolution authorizing payment of a gratuity to survivor of deceased Senate employee.

Committee approved a contract entered into by the Architect of the Capitol and Kalervo Kallio for the execution of a marble bust of the late Vice President Alben W. Barkley.

Committee also announced that an ad hoc committee had been appointed to consider various suggested amendments to the cloture rule of the Senate.

#### FOREIGN AID STUDY

*Special committee* to study the foreign aid program had as witnesses Senator Javits, who submitted general testimony on the foreign aid programs; Eric Johnston, chairman of the International Development Advisory Board, who testified and answered questions with regard to a







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 5, 1957  
For actions of April 4, 1957  
85th-1st, No. 59

## CONTENTS

Accounting.....41	Farm program.....12	Monopolies.....27
Adjournment.....24	Flood control.....18	Poultry.....14,23
Appropriations.....1,7,44	Flood insurance.....18	Property.....42
Assistant Secretary.....37	Food and drug.....1	Reclamation.....7
Budget.....8,28	Food, surplus.....2	Reorganization.....5,39
Corn.....15,23	Foreign aid.....10	Small business.....4,22,38
Cotton.....31	Forestry.....6	Soil bank.....15,33
Dairy.....40	Freight rates.....21	Soil conservation.....32
Deferred grazing.....11,23	Housing.....45	Sugar.....17
Depressed areas.....3,20,26	Humane slaughter.....30	Tariff.....9
Disaster relief.....34	Insect control.....43	Trade, foreign.....9,35
Drought relief.....11,23	Lands.....7,42	Transportation.....21,29
Electrification.....16,36	Legislative program...7,23	Vehicles.....19
Export-Import Bank.....7	Meatpacking.....13	Water, pollution.....1
Farm credit.....25	Minerals.....6	resources.....36

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to provide Jt. Committee on Budget. Sens. Ellender and Humphrey criticized Secretary's speech before Republican Women's Conference. Sen. Watkins urged transfer of certain Packers-Stockyards work from USDA to FTC. Senate committee reported deferred grazing bill. Sen. Humphrey urged sending surplus food to Poland. Senate received President's message recommending U. S. membership in CTC. House passed Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Sen. McClellan introduced and discussed bill to extend time for submission of reorganization plans. Sens. Morse and Neuberger introduced and Sen. Morse discussed bills to provide emergency loans to certain orchardists. Sen. Byrd submitted and discussed resolution for consolidation of appropriations bills.

## HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H.R. 6287, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1958 (pp. 4614-29, A2724, A2725-26). On roll call votes rejected 130-285, an amendment to reduce from \$9,300,000 to \$7,973,000 funds for the Food and Drug Administration (p. 4621); and rejected, 185 to 231, an amendment to strike out \$50,000,000 for grants to States for waste treatment works construction under the Water Pollution Control Act (pp. 4622-23).

Began debate on H.R. 6500, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1958. pp. 4629-30

The Appropriations Committee received permission until midnight today, Apr. 5, to file a report on the 1958 Commerce Department appropriation bill. p. 4614

2. SURPLUS FOODS. Rep. Philbin stated that he understood that the U. S. was now considering arrangements for sending surplus foods to Poland, and urged that we do so. pp. 4631-32

3. DEPRESSED AREAS. Rep. Hale urged the passage of legislation for Federal assistance to depressed areas, and pointed out the need for such assistance in Maine. p. 4632



4. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Griffiths spoke in favor of additional Federal assistance to small businesses. p. 4636
5. ORGANIZATION. Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau a proposed bill "to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended"; to Government Operations Committees. pp. 4517, 4637
6. FORESTRY; MINERALS. Both Houses received an Alaska Legislature memorial requesting that no more wilderness areas or other withdrawals be made of known mineralized sections of Alaska which would place these lands within the scope of such proposed national wilderness preservation system. pp. 4519, 4638
7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the next order of business is consideration of the D. C. appropriation bill, to be followed next week by consideration of the Commerce Department appropriation bill, extension of the Export-Import Bank Act, amendment of the Small Reclamation Projects Act, and the military land withdrawals bill. pp. 4629, 4630

SENATE

8. BUDGETING. Passed with an amendment by Sen. Mansfield to delete the requirement that agency submissions might be made on an annual accrued expenditure basis, S. 1585, to provide for a Joint Committee on the Budget. Sen. Mansfield inserted a statement by Sen. Kennedy on the deletion.  
Received a N. Mex. Legislature resolution requesting Congress to propose a Constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. p. 4518  
Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution opposing reductions in expenditures for farm relief, conservation, and other items. p. 4522  
Sen. Robertson discussed Congressional control over the purse, and inserted a tabulation of the authorization balances carried forward for expenditures in fiscal 1958. pp. 4553-5  
Sen. Thurmond inserted a letter from a S. C. High School favoring budget reductions, and urged the Senate to cut nonessential spending. p. 4589
9. FOREIGN TRADE. Received from the President a message recommending legislation to authorize U. S. membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation (H. Doc. 146); to Finance Committee. pp. 4511-12  
Both Houses received from the Commerce Dept. a proposed bill to authorize membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. pp. 4517, 4637  
Received a Nev. Legislature resolution urging Congress to return to tariff adjustment based on protection. pp. 4517-18
10. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Humphrey urged sending surplus food to Poland, and inserted an excerpt from the President's press conference, and two editorials favoring help to Poland. pp. 4543-9  
Sen. Javits inserted a petition from the American Order of Gen. Pulaski, favoring aid to Poland. p. 4522
11. DROUGHT RELIEF. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 511, to establish a deferred grazing and a protein feed program to aid drought-stricken areas (S. Rept. 206). p. 4522
12. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Ellender criticized a speech by the Secretary before the Republican Women's Conference and administration of the farm program. pp. 4574-82, 4602-11



## DEFERRED GRAZING

---

APRIL 4, 1957.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,  
submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany S. 511]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 511) to establish a deferred-grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

This bill would require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a program in the drought areas under which farmers and ranchers would receive payments for deferring grazing. This would tend to avoid excessive grazing, which removes the cover from the land and subjects it to erosion, and give the grass time to reseed itself. The evidence before the committee at its hearings on this and other drought relief bills was that the present drought, which covers parts of 15 States, is the longest and most severe in the history of the area. It will take much of the land a number of years to be restored to productivity, and a deferred grazing program is essential for this purpose.

The bill would be effective only in the drought areas determined major disaster areas for that reason under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and, as amended by the committee amendment, would be effective only for 5 years after enactment of the bill. It would be effective only in counties in which the Secretary of Agriculture determined that grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production and found that limitation of grazing is necessary to reestablish or conserve grass for grazing.

Under the committee amendment the program may provide for limited use as well as nonuse. Complete deferment may not be the best solution from the standpoint of range conservation in many cases, and in such cases complete deferment would require larger than necessary Federal payments, deprive the area of a needed feed resource,

and require unnecessary liquidation of herds, with consequent downward pressure on prices.

Under the committee amendment the program would be applicable only to nonfederally owned land. The regulation of grazing upon land owned by the Federal Government is by law generally made the responsibility of certain Federal departments such as the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. The committee believes that these Federal departments have the necessary legal authority to deal adequately with the conservation of such grazing lands, and therefore it is not necessary that the bill cover such lands. However, Indian lands in which the bare legal title is vested in the Federal Government, but in which the beneficial ownership is in Indian tribes or individual Indians, would be eligible for participation in the program to the same extent as privately owned lands. While the bill does not cover Federal grazing lands, the program should be so administered that it does not result in the loss by farmers and ranchers participating in the program of their permits to graze on Taylor Grazing Act, national forest, or other federally owned lands. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture should enter into nonuse arrangements with grazing permittees whose basic properties are, in whole or in part, placed in the program in order to preserve the qualifications of such properties for grazing permits.

Payment rates under the committee amendment would be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture at not more than the fair rental value of the land for the normal grazing use withheld. This reflects the committee's recommendation that limited use as well as nonuse of the land be provided for. The committee also felt that payment at not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the county, as provided by the bill as introduced, would make the program unduly attractive to the poorer lands in each county. The fair rental value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, for the grazing use withheld, based on periods of average precipitation when grazing is normal, appeared to the committee to represent a fair standard, and it is the committee's intent that payment rates should be fixed at that amount.

No payment would be made if the livestock are shifted to other land and such shift results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any one person would be limited to \$5,000 for land in any one county, or land operated as a single unit. Payment could not be made under this program and any other program for the same deferral of grazing.

Section 5 of the bill as introduced is omitted from the committee amendment. The House struck an identical provision out of H. R. 2367 and the committee is advised that the House Committee on Agriculture intends to hold hearings on the matters covered by this section. Consequently your committee felt that section 5 should be considered as separate legislation, so that it would not delay provision for the deferred grazing program which is urgently needed at this time.

The cost of the program has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture at \$30 million for the next 2 years. The cost in the succeeding 3 years would, of course, depend on the area and intensity of the drought and other factors not now determinable. The Department's estimate is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
*Washington, April 4, 1957.*

Mr. HARKER T. STANTON,  
*Counsel, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,  
Senate Office Building.*

DEAR MR. STANTON: Yesterday you asked for an estimate of the amount of appropriation that would be required under S. 511 as reported out of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry yesterday.

We believe that \$30 million is a reasonable estimate of the amount of payments and administrative costs for such a grazing program for the next 2 years. This estimate has been made on the assumption that the Department would have administrative discretion under this authority to provide a deferred grazing program including nonuse or limited use based on the conditions surrounding individual ranch proposals very similar to the discretion we now have under regular ACP programs.

Sincerely yours,

K. L. SCOTT,  
*Director, Agricultural Credit Services.*

○





85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 511

[Report No. 206]

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 10 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

APRIL 4, 1957

Reported by Mr. HOLLAND, with amendments

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

---

## A BILL

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       ~~That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-~~  
4       ~~tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by~~  
5       ~~the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-~~  
6       ~~ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as~~  
7       ~~amended, the President is authorized and directed as part~~  
8       ~~of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate~~  
9       ~~and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of~~

1 Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county  
2 affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to  
3 be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such pro-  
4 gram shall be applicable only to land which is normally used  
5 for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that  
6 deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the  
7 land. Such program in any county shall be made available  
8 to farmers and ranchers immediately, and shall remain avail-  
9 able for a period of not less than three years after the termi-  
10 nation of such county as a major disaster area.

11 SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
12 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
13 not less than the average annual rental value of grazing  
14 land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in  
15 the program to accomplish its objective, taking into con-  
16 sideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds avail-  
17 able for carrying out the program, and any other relevant  
18 factors. No payment shall be made under the program if  
19 the deferred grazing is for a period of less than twelve con-  
20 secutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock  
21 from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch  
22 results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any  
23 person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall  
24 not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

25 SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include



1 such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically  
2 provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate  
3 its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The  
4 program authorized herein for any county shall be in addi-  
5 tion to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such  
6 county authorized by any other law, except that no payment  
7 shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under  
8 this and any other program concurrently.

9       SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,  
10 in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for  
11 the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such  
12 funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized  
13 herein.

14       SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, Eighty-first  
15 Congress (Act of April 6, 1949) is amended to read as  
16 follows:

17       “(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with  
18 any major disaster determined by the President to warrant  
19 assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law  
20 875, Eighty-first Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended,  
21 to furnish to establish farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed  
22 for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods  
23 of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary  
24 may determine to be required by the nature and effect of  
25 the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of

1 roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any com-  
2 bination thereof, and the amount recommended by the  
3 State extension service which, with other feed available will  
4 provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd  
5 of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel,  
6 facilities, property, and funds of any agency of the United  
7 States Department of Agriculture, including Commodity  
8 Credit Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall  
9 reimburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any  
10 commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers  
11 or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses  
12 necessary in performing such functions."

13 *That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connec-*  
14 *tion with any major disaster due to drought determined by*  
15 *the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Govern-*  
16 *ment under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as*  
17 *amended, the President is authorized and directed as part*  
18 *of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate*  
19 *and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of*  
20 *Agriculture, a deferred grazing program, which shall in-*  
21 *clude nonuse or limited use, or any needed combination*  
22 *thereof, in any county affected by such disaster in which*  
23 *the Secretary of Agriculture determines grazing of native*  
24 *rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production,*

1 and finds that limited or deferred grazing is necessary and  
2 appropriate for the reestablishment or conservation of grass  
3 for grazing. Such program shall be applicable only to non-  
4 federally owned land which is normally used for grazing.  
5 Within thirty days (1) after the date of enactment of this  
6 Act, or (2) after any subsequent designation of any such  
7 area as a disaster area by the President, the Secretary shall  
8 designate the counties in any such area in which this pro-  
9 gram shall be available, and the program shall remain avail-  
10 able in each such county for a period of not more than five  
11 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

12       SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for de-  
13 ferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates  
14 determined by the Secretary but not more than the estimated  
15 fair rental value of the land for the normal grazing use  
16 withheld under the program and which will induce sufficient  
17 participation in the program to accomplish its objective,  
18 taking into consideration the normal grazing capacity of  
19 the land, the funds available for carrying out the program,  
20 and any other relevant factors. No payment shall be made  
21 under the program if it is determined that a shift of live-  
22 stock from the deferred areas to other land results in over-  
23 grazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for  
24 deferred grazing on land in any one county or land in more



1 *than one county operated as a single unit shall not exceed*  
2 *\$5,000 for any one year.*

3 *SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include*  
4 *such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically*  
5 *provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate*  
6 *its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The*  
7 *program authorized herein for any county shall be supple-*  
8 *mental to the agricultural conservation program, and not in*  
9 *substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by*  
10 *any other law, except that no payment shall be made con-*  
11 *currently on the same land for deferred grazing under this*  
12 *and any other program.*

13 *SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated,*  
14 *in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for*  
15 *the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such*  
16 *funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized*  
17 *herein.*

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes."



85TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

**S. 511**

[Report No. 206]

---

---

**A BILL**

---

---

To establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes. \*

---

---

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas

---

---

JANUARY 10 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1957  
Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry

APRIL 4, 1957

Reported with amendments







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 9, 1957  
For actions of April 8, 1957  
85th-1st, No. 61

### CONTENTS

Administrative law.....16	Forestry.....21,41	Research.....9
Animal disease.....19	Housing, rural.....9	Roads.....24
Appropriations.....8	Information.....7	Small business.....33,43
Area development.....17,31	Insect control.....1	Soil bank.....28,38
Audit.....14	Lands.....20,44	Soil conservation.....14
Budget.....13,34	Livestock.....19,40	Statehood.....23,27
Corn.....12	Loans, farm.....1,47	Territories.....22
Cotton.....2	Organization.....37	Trade, foreign.....5
Deferred grazing.....11	Personnel.....45, 32,36	Transportation.....26
Drought relief.....11	Plant pests.....1	Water, resources.....18,29
Electrification.....15,35	Poultry.....10,25	pollution.....39
Flood insurance.....6	Price supports.....2,3,30	Wildlife.....38
Food additives.....4	Property.....42	
	Reclamation.....46	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed poultry inspection bill. Senate passed deferred grazing bill. House Rules Committee cleared plant pests control bill. House Committee reported bill to extend 1956 price supports for extra long staple cotton. Rep. Knutson criticized Secretary's position on price supports as reported in press. Rep. Lesinski introduced and discussed bill to provide health insurance program for Federal employees. Rep. Dingell urged technical assistance to depressed areas. Sen. Goldwater criticized budget. Senate committee reported bill to authorize training of Federal employees at public or private facilities. Senate committee reported bill to authorize this Department to make loans to desert-land entrymen.

### HOUSE

1. INSECT CONTROL. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H.R. 3476, to facilitate the regulation, control, and eradication of plant pests. pp. 4716, 4741
2. COTTON. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H.R. 3654, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to continue the price support for extra long staple cotton at the 1956 rate (H. Rept. 312). p. 4741
3. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Knutson criticized the Secretary's position, as reported in a newspaper, that he favors the elimination of all mandatory farm-price supports. p. 4735
4. FOOD ADDITIVES. Both Houses received from HEW a proposed bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of chemical additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; to H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce and S. Labor and Public Welfare Committees. pp. 4654, 4740



5. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Bailey spoke in opposition to congressional approval for U.S. membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, and criticized the President's rejection of recent recommendations of the Tariff Commission under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act restricting the importation of certain products. pp. 4736-37
6. FLOOD INSURANCE. Rep. Sullivan criticized the delay in making Federal flood insurance available to the public, and inserted correspondence with the Federal Flood Indemnity Commissioner on the matter. pp. 4737-39
7. INFORMATION. Conferees were appointed on H.R. 4813, to extend the life of the D. C. Auditorium Commission. Senate conferees have not yet been appointed. p. 4708
8. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H.R. 6500, the D. C. appropriation bill for 1958. pp. 4723-35

9. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H.R. 6659, to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing. (H. Rept. 313). p. 4741

The bill includes a provision directing the Housing and Home Finance Agency to carry out a study of farm housing, including development of information on the adequacy of existing housing, needs for housing, problems faced by farmers in connection with housing, interrelation of farm and city housing, etc.; provides that such research shall be conducted by the land-grant colleges and shall be financed by HHFA; and authorizes such grants not exceeding \$300,000 for each of the years 1958 and 1959.

SENATE

10. POULTRY. Passed with amendments S. 1747, providing for the compulsory inspection by this Department of poultry and poultry products (pp. 4667-81). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Revercomb to limit such inspection to poultry about to be slaughtered at the processing plant (pp. 4674-5). By unanimous consent two typographical errors were corrected (p. 4667).  
Sen. Malone inserted a Nev. Legislature resolution urging a Federal system of poultry inspection similar to that for other meats. p. 4658

11. DROUGHT RELIEF. Passed H.R. 2367, to provide a deferred grazing program for drought stricken areas, inserting the text of S. 511, and with an amendment by Sen. Johnson to provide payments equal to the fair rental value of the land instead of establishing this as the maximum (pp. 4683-4). pp. 4681-97

12. CORN. S. 1771, to provide for a 1957 corn-base acreage of 51 million acres, was made the unfinished business. p. 4697

13. BUDGETING. Sen. Goldwater criticized the current levels of Government spending and taxation, and inserted an anonymous article, "How Freedom Vanished In The Ancient World By Popular Vote." pp. 4698-4705

Received an Ark. Legislature resolution urging support of five constitutional amendments, including the Byrd-Bridges balanced budget amendment, the Reed-Dirksen amendment to limit the top rate of income taxes, and the Bricker amendment. p. 4655

14. SOIL CONSERVATION. Received an audit report from the Comptroller General of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service for fiscal 1955. p. 4654



## FEATURES OF PROGRAM

Under the control plan, market flocks must be treated with a tetracycline drug at rate of 400 grams per ton of feed for 2 weeks, then at 100 grams for 2 more weeks. If no evidence of the disease is then found, birds may be moved to processing plants under veterinary inspection; plants must follow procedures approved by public health officials.

Breeder flocks are treated the same as market birds. Eggs from such flocks can be hatched on the premises; or they may be hatched in outside hatcheries used for no other purpose, if disinfected in approved manner. Poults from eggs produced in infected flocks before or during antibiotic treatment must be returned to the original premise and kept under surveillance for 6 months.

Poults hatched from eggs produced after antibiotic treatment may go any place in the State, there to be maintained also under surveillance for 6 months.

All poults from infected flocks must be started on and fed a ration containing 200 grams of tetracycline drug for 3 weeks. Poults from eggs of infected flocks prior to treatment can be held for breeding purposes only upon approval of the Department.

## CONTROLS FOLLOWED

In line with the program outlined, on April 22 all birds in the two infected flocks were slaughtered. The Department conducted ante mortem inspection of birds and released for slaughter only those fully recovered during the course of inspections. Our veterinarians condemned 84 toms and 535 hens as result of ante mortem and post mortem inspection procedures, and the State paid owners 80 percent of appraised value for all birds ordered destroyed.

Some poults were hatched on the quarantine places and one owner hatched a setting at an unused hatchery near Junction City. These poults will be kept under State watch for 6 months; if at the end of that time no indication of disease appears, they will be retained for breeding purposes.

So there you have Operation Quarantine, with special emphasis on use in emergency situations. And, somehow, what could have happened in the turkey incident—but didn't—may remind you of dad's yarn about Ol' Jake fleeing from a fire with only a cake in his hands.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

**MR. JOHNSON of Texas.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**MR. JOHNSON of Texas.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1747) was passed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4813) to extend

the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORRISON, Mr. MULTER, Mrs. GRANAHAN, Mr. KEARNS, and Mr. BROYHILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

## DEFERRED GRAZING

**MR. JOHNSON of Texas.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 202, Senate bill 511.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (S. 511) to establish a deferred-grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program, which shall include nonuse or limited use, or any needed combination thereof, in any county affected by such disaster in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and finds that limited or deferred grazing is necessary and appropriate for the reestablishment or conservation of grass for grazing. Such program shall be applicable only to nonfederally owned land which is normally used for grazing. Within 30 days (1) after the date of enactment of this act, or (2) after any subsequent designation of any such area as a disaster area by the President, the Secretary shall designate the counties in any such area in which this program shall be available, and the program shall remain available in each such county for a period of not more than 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

Sec. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates determined by the Secretary but not more than the estimated fair rental value of the land for the normal grazing use withheld under the program and which will induce sufficient participation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration the normal grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors. No payment shall be made under the program if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other land results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county or land in more than one county operated as a single unit shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

Sec. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition

to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be supplemental to the agricultural conservation program, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made concurrently on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program.

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

**MR. HOLLAND.** Mr. President, Senate bill 511, introduced by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], would require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a program in the drought area under which farmers and ranchers would receive payments for deferred grazing. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held 2 days' hearings on this bill and other bills relating to drought relief. Eight or ten bills have been introduced on this subject, and they were all considered by the committee at its hearing.

The evidence before the subcommittee was that the present drought, which covers portions of 15 States, is the longest and most severe in the history of that area, and that a deferred grazing program to prevent excessive grazing and give the grass time to reseed is urgently needed. The committee was advised that, even with such a program, much of the land will require a number of years to be restored to productivity. On that point, of course, the situation is not uniform, but there are some lands in the area which have suffered a sustained drought for as long as 5 years.

The evidence before the committee indicated that in such places of extreme disaster not only had the grass completely disappeared and the roots died, but the more permanent growth, which usually survives most droughts, was entirely dead. There were places in which such sturdy plants as the mesquite, for example, were dead and had been dead for a long period. In such areas it was obvious that when the return of the turf began it must be protected for a period of months, or even years, in some cases, before there could be any real reestablishment of grass sufficient for grazing purposes.

The subcommittee and the committee carefully considered the views of the Department of Agriculture and the testimony of the witnesses at the hearings, and made a number of changes in the bill, which are incorporated in the committee amendment.

As revised by the committee, the amended bill contains a number of safeguards to assure that the program will be effective, and also restricted to the situations in which it is needed. Some of the safeguards are as follows:

First, the bill would be effective only in major disaster areas, declared to be such under Public Law 875, because of drought, that is, areas in which the dis-



asters were so great that, upon recommendation of the government of the State and of the Secretary of Agriculture, the President would have declared such areas to be disaster areas.

Second, it would be effective for only 5 years after its enactment. If continuation of the program after that period should be found to be necessary—and, of course, we all hope that the drought will have been broken and the entire situation cleared up earlier than that—Congress could act to continue the program. However, the program would not continue indefinitely without further consideration and enactment by the Congress. That is one of the changes made in the original Senate bill 511, which provided that the operation of the bill should be for not less than 3 years. However, that bill did not set any maximum time of operation. The committee felt that, in both directions, this change was necessary. There should not be any minimum time of operation, because the evidence was clear that there were different stages of disaster, some of which might easily be corrected in much less than 3 years; and it was also recognized that there were other stages of disaster which would run the full 3 years, and might run longer than that.

Third, the bill would be effective only in counties in which the grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and then only if a limitation of grazing is necessary to reestablish or conserve grass for grazing. A finding to that effect would in each case be required by the Secretary of Agriculture—that is, that native rangeland was a substantial factor in agricultural production in the particular area, and that limitation of grazing was necessary to reestablish or conserve grass for that purpose.

The Senate will understand, I am sure, that we are talking about native rangeland. We are not talking about improved pastures, where outside grasses have been brought in and established under some kind of special care.

Fourth, the program would provide for limited use as well as nonuse. The original bill—in general a very good bill—covered only nonuse for periods of time. From the testimony it was quite clear that even on the same ranch there would be some special spots where limited use rather than nonuse would be required, and that it would be to the economic advantage of all concerned to have such a finding made and a responsive program put into effect. In some cases complete deferment may not be the best solution from the standpoint of range conservation.

In these cases partial limitation of use would mean lower Federal payments, use of the land to meet needed feed requirements, and avoidance of unnecessary herd liquidation with consequent downward pressure on prices.

On that point I should like to elaborate only with respect to lower Federal payments, because that is a subject, of course, in which everyone is interested. Of course it will require less money if the Secretary prescribes limited use as the proper treatment for a particular

tract or a part of a tract, because, obviously, the value of the use withheld would be less if only a part of the use were withheld than it would be if the entire use were withheld.

Fifth, no payment would be made under the program if livestock were shifted from deferred areas to other lands, and the shift should result in overgrazing nondeferred areas. This, too, is believed to be a great improvement over the original bill. This concept was contained in the bill as introduced, but it covered only shifts from one part of the farm or ranch to another. The committee felt, and provides in its amendment, that this particular part of the bill should cover shifts not only to lands on the farm, but also to lands off the farm. Therefore, the committee amendment is somewhat tighter than the original bill.

Sixth, payment to any person for deferring grazing on land in any county, or on land in more than one county if operated as a single unit, is limited to \$5,000 for any year. Here again the committee amendment has tightened up the provision of the original bill by extending this limitation to land in more than one county when operated as a single unit.

On that point I should like to say that the original bill provided for limitation of \$5,000 in any one county, without regard to the concept that a single ranch operated as a single unit might lie within two counties, or in even more than two counties. Therefore the modified wording reported in the committee amendment provides that the limit shall be \$5,000 per county, with the additional limitation that if a single unit of ranch land lies in more than one county, the limit of \$5,000 shall apply to the entire ranch unit.

In addition to the safeguards which are specifically contained in the bill and which I have just enumerated, the President is given authority to impose such additional reasonable safeguards as he may deem necessary to assure proper administration and the accomplishment of the objectives of the program.

For instance, he may require fencing of the deferred areas at the expense of the program participant, where that appears necessary to proper administration of the program. The authority and duty to provide such additional safeguards as may be necessary is inherent in the direction to the President to formulate a program.

The committee knew that there would be many details which would vary in different areas, and that there would be requirements which could not be foreseen at this time, no matter how hard the committee or Congress might try to foresee all of them. So that while foreseeing and making provisions for a great many details in the original bill and even to a greater degree in the committee substitute, the committee bill would also leave much regulatory power to the administrators of the act, and would give to the President the authority to formulate regulations.

For instance, under the committee amendment, payment rates would be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture at

not more than the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld.

I ask Senators to follow this point very carefully because, in my judgment, this is perhaps the most important change in the bill, and I should not want to have any misunderstanding about it. The committee feels that this language is a great improvement over the provision of the bill as originally introduced, which provided for rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the entire county. Such a provision would have encouraged participation by the owners of the poorest land in the county and made participation unattractive to the owners of better lands. The provision recommended by the committee proposes to treat everyone fairly; that is, on the basis of actual value of his own land, and achieves more conservation for the money spent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First of all, Mr. President, I wish to express my deep personal thanks to the Senator from Florida for the very fine work he has done on the pending bill and for the many hours he has spent in an attempt to bring before the Senate some workable legislation in this field. I know that all of us in the drought-stricken States owe him a deep debt of gratitude. I agree with the comments he has made respecting the various improvements contained in the bill over the original draft of the bill as introduced by me on January 10.

Whenever the senior Senator from Florida works on any measure for very long an improvement always results. The provision to which he has just referred, on page 5, section 2, of the bill, reads as follows:

The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates determined by the Secretary, but not more than the estimated fair rental value of the land for the normal grazing use withheld.

As I recall, and as the senior Senator from Florida just stated, the original bill provided for such rate of rates not less than the average rental value of grazing land.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Texas, in his bill, provided for a minimum, but not for a maximum, and based that minimum on the fair value of the average of all grazing lands in the county.

Witnesses pointed out—and it was also pointed out by representatives of the Department of Agriculture who were kind enough to sit in with us at some length—that such a provision would be highly attractive to owners of submarginal grazing land, but would not be attractive at all to the owners of excellent grazing land, and would be a kind of leveling factor which would make of this legislation quite a different kind of act from what the Senator from Texas had in mind.

In fact, when I talked to the distinguished Senator from Texas about it, I found him completely ready to turn to the value of the land itself which was



being dealt with in any particular case.

On the point with respect to the concept of the committee, the committee in its report makes it very clear by using the following language:

Payment rates under the committee amendment would be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture at not more than the fair rental value of land for the normal grazing use withheld.

This language reflects the committee's recommendation that limited use as well as nonuse may be provided for.

When we say "grazing use withheld," it may mean limited use, or it may mean complete withholding of all use.

The committee also felt that payment at not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the county, as provided by the bill as introduced, would make the program unduly attractive to the poorer lands in each county.

At a matter of fact, we felt that, worse than that, it would be a kind of leveling off factor, which would not meet the need of the average rancher, who has always had a difficult problem to solve.

Then I call attention particularly to this sentence:

The fair rental value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, for the grazing use withheld, based on periods of average precipitation when grazing is normal, appeared to the committee to represent a fair standard, and it is the committee's intent that payment rates should be fixed at that amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator has said. I wonder if he would have any objection to our writing that intent into the bill itself. I have discussed it with the committee staff, and I think they have the text of an amendment which will accomplish the purpose.

The language now in the bill would allow for exactly the type of rental payments which this amendment would provide. The committee report on page 2 declares the committee's intent to be exactly that. It states:

The fair rental value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, for the grazing use withheld, based on periods of average precipitation when grazing is normal, appeared to the committee to represent a fair standard, and it is the committee's intent that payment rates should be fixed at that amount.

The language of my amendment simply carries out this intent with full statutory authority. It is of great importance to the success of the deferred grazing program that the Congress itself assure disaster-stricken ranchers that they will receive the compensation for land withdrawn from grazing which they are entitled to and which can afford them the real chance to utilize the provisions of the bill. Unless the payments to each rancher represent the fair rental value for his land, he simply could not be induced to place his land under the program, with serious loss both to him, the land and our economy resulting.

The amendment is at the desk. If it would be agreeable to the Senator from Florida, I should like to have the amend-

ment stated, so that consideration may be given to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Florida has no control over that, and would be glad to have the amendment stated. If the Senate wishes to accept the amendment, that would be all right. But I may say that a great deal of work has been done in drafting the bill in an effort to have it in such shape that all members of the committee would approve it. I believe that all members of the committee have approved it. It may be that some Senators were not present when the bill was ordered reported, so I would not like to make an unqualified statement that all members of the committee have approved it.

I see on the floor the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the ranking minority member of the committee. As I recall, only 9 or 10 members of the committee were present, but all of us approved the bill in the form in which it was before us.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that although I was called to another committee meeting before the vote was actually taken, I expressed myself as being in favor of the bill, and left my proxy with the Senator from Florida to report the bill.

I am well aware of the problem which confronted the committee, and with which the Senator from Texas is concerned. The committee realized that if we used the language "average rental value for the county" or even "a percentage of the average rental value for the county," a large amount of land having the lowest value for grazing purposes and probably very little of the land of the highest value for grazing purposes would come into the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall the number of members of the committee who actually voted to report the measure? As I recall, it was 10 or 11, instead of the full 15.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to do so, I wish to state my amendment. On page 5, beginning in line 13, the amendment proposes to strike out beginning with the word "such" through the period in line 20, and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation."

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as I am concerned, that is what we meant in the report on the bill. Therefore, I would certainly have no objection to placing that language in the bill. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has just assured me that he would have no objection to it, either.

I wish to call this point, if I may, to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Texas. While I am perfectly willing to support his amendment, if it be adopted on the floor, the provision of the Senate bill would then be more like the provision of the House bill, and the mat-

ter would not allow as much latitude in conference. I call that to the attention of the Senator from Texas simply because I am extremely anxious to have the Senate pass a bill which will be approved and become law. I have been working hard toward that end.

It seems to me that it might be the part of wisdom to leave the bill in the form in which it is, and to let this proposal be worked out in conference. At that time we can get some positive assurance that the signing of the bill will be recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, which will be as nearly complete assurance as we can ever have that the bill will become law.

I am perfectly willing to go along with the amendment of the Senator from Texas, if he thinks that is the better policy, but I call attention to the fact that we have an informal memorandum from the Department of Agriculture, submitted only this morning, in which there is no assurance that the Secretary approves the bill. I quote the final two paragraphs in the memorandum which cause me the only concern I have:

The changes enumerated above—

The memorandum enumerated all the changes the committee made—

will result in an improvement of the bill. In its present form—

That means the committee amendment—

the bill could be administered in a satisfactory manner.

So much for the workability of the bill. The memorandum continues:

Since the Department already has authority to operate the program under the agricultural-conservation program, which would be substantially identical with the program described in the present bill, we do not believe enactment of S. 511 is essential. If Congress will act favorably on the request for appropriation, which is now pending before the Congress in House Document 115, which would provide funds for carrying out a deferred-grazing program under the agricultural-conservation program, the Department can deal effectively with the problem involved.

I personally do not agree with the comment contained in the memorandum that the making of an appropriation for this year would be as adequate as the passage of the bill, because the bill will require some years in which to operate and to deal properly with this question. But I am somewhat concerned with the statement, which is a lot less than full endorsement of the bill, and indicates that officials of the Department think that with appropriations from year to year they can handle the program, and that "we do not believe that the enactment of S. 511 is essential."

For that reason alone, I say to my distinguished friend, it seems to me that it would be the part of caution for us to have a little leeway with which to go into conference. There will be a full conference on the matter, because the Senate bill is quite different in detail from that of the House. In the meantime we can ascertain what should be done in order to provide legislation on the particular subject we are now discussing.



I have worked hard on the bill. I am perfectly willing to continue to work on it. If the Senator from Texas will allow the bill to go to conference as it is, I shall do my best to get the approval of the Secretary of the identical objective the Senator has in mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not care to find myself in opposition to the distinguished Senator from Florida. He has done most commendable work on the bill, and has improved it from the way in which it was originally introduced. I commend the Senator from Florida upon the many improvements he has made.

I simply suggest that we include in the bill what the Senator has put in the report. I do not see any reason why that should not be done. I had the feeling that it would be agreeable to all concerned. The language that is proposed to be placed in the bill is not the language of the House bill; it is not the language of the Senate bill, which provides for an average annual rental value. All the amendment proposes is "rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation."

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understand, the Senator proposes to change the wording of the amended bill so as to make it clear that what has been stated in the report is the meaning of the Senate when it passes the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Precisely. We will not have "any more than" or "any less than." We will have, "equal to the fair rental value." I understand that is what the distinguished Senator wants to have done.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is completely correct. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment and to support it in every way. But I felt that there was at least a point which I should call to the attention of my distinguished friend. There would be more leeway for us in conference to meet any recalcitrance we might encounter on the part of the Department of Agriculture, which has not had time to give us a complete yes or nay answer, and has not done so, with reference to the committee bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I personally do not find the amendment suggested by the Senator from Texas objectionable in any way. I think what it proposes is what is intended by the committee. I believe the conferees who will be appointed on the part of the Senate will be well justified in simply declining to accept the language of the House bill, which requires the average rental value for the county to be paid, because that obviously would make the bill unworkable.

The Secretary of Agriculture has pointed out in his communication to the Senator from Florida that the proposed legislation probably is unnecessary to

accomplish his purpose, provided the Committee on Appropriations will make adequate provisions for carrying out the program under existing law.

However, if the Congress passes the bill in the form now suggested on the floor and if the bill as thus passed is enacted into law—and it seems there could hardly be objection to it by the administration—then it would seem evident that there would be direction to the Appropriations Committee to proceed to report the necessary appropriations required in order to proceed with the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in response to the statement which has been made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who speaks so frequently and so correctly in regard to the position of the administration, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment to the committee amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "such rate or rates determined by the Secretary but not more than the estimated fair rental value of the land for the normal grazing use withheld under the program and which will induce sufficient participation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration the normal grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors," and to insert "rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

#### DISPARITY IN SIZE OF COUNTIES—THE FAIR VALUE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to add to the statement by the Senator from Texas that especially in some of the Western States, where the counties are almost as large as some of the States in other parts of the country.

Therefore, the conditions in the Western States are not the same; there are widely varying conditions within the counties.

The amendment of the Senator from Texas to fix this fair value takes care of that situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for the hearings

which were held on the bill and for reporting the bill to the Senate.

Early in January, I introduced S. 885 a bill on this subject, for consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I stated that the subcommittee which conducted the hearing, did so on 10 bills, all dealing with the same subject matter. I wish to assure the Senator from Kansas that one of the bills was his.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Florida very much.

I wish to be certain that I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment. As I understand, it would strike out certain words which were inserted by the committee, and as to which there was some difference of opinion. So I understand that, as a result of the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment, the words "but not more" in line 14, page 5, are now out of the bill.

In that connection, let me state that my bill used the words "but not less." The committee, however, included in the amendment it reported the words "but not more." The words "but not more" have now been stricken from the committee amendment, as I understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. The amendment strikes out those words, and makes the meaning clear. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment, it provides that the exact fair rental value of the land deferred, or limited, shall be the measure of the Federal compensation, which the Secretary shall determine on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation.

Mr. CARLSON. Then I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether the committee members had in mind some specific instances or whether they considered only the normal or average basis in connection with the making of payments for the land in these areas. It has been stated that some areas allow 4 acres per head for grazing and some allow 12 or 12 acres per head. Were there any specific figures to show what the payments might be to the individual landowners based on the grazing capacity of the land for deferred grazing?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; 85 cents an acre and \$1 an acre were mentioned. I remember that both figures were mentioned in the hearings. I am sure there is variation above and below those figures. I am speaking now of annual payments.

Under the concept of the committee amendment, the exact value of the particular land for the use that is deferred or limited will be determined as of the time when normal conditions prevailed. That price will be the price required to be paid to those who bring the land into this program.

It was the feeling of the committee that the Nation itself has a very great stake in restoring the cover to these lands, so much of which is now in very poor condition, and may become almost a desert unless there is provided some



program whereby they may be restored to a reasonable good growing condition.

It is our concept that in order to obtain the cooperation of the landholder who is required to cut down his herd, and as Senators know, is required to find feed where he can—and the Federal Government has as another program one to help him get feed at about half price—this should be required, too, as a condition and as an objective eminently worthwhile to the Nation, the State, the grazer, and all others concerned. He should receive at least payments amounting to the normal grazing value of the land which he is eliminating from grazing or which he is limiting in grazing.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to point out that the conditions for grazing and the value of grazing differ in various parts of the Nation; they even differ within a State. For instance, in Kansas we have some areas where as many as 10 acres per head is considered necessary. Then we have the great blue stem area, to which hundreds of thousands of cattle are shipped from Texas every grazing season. This area has gone through a severe drought for the past 4 or 5 years. It will be very helpful if we can obtain a deferred grazing program which will allow some of the grassland to reseed itself and thereby rebuild a firm growth.

I wish to be sure that we provide for the making of payments for deferred grazing, in order that the grass will be built up for the future, but also make sure that the payments will not be so high as to encourage the liquidation of herds.

This proposed legislation can be of permanent value to the grazing areas of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. A moment ago I referred to 85 cents an acre and \$1 an acre. Those were the figures I recalled as having been used in the hearings. But I have just been advised, by counsel for the committee, that in the conference with the regulatory agencies of the Department of Agriculture, which already have had experience in this field with lands that are good, lands that are medium, and lands that are very poor, they have told him that the normal grazing values, in their experience, go from a minimum of 20 cents to a maximum of about \$1 an acre a year. I personally have no information in that field, because in my State the grazing situation is so different that it is not applicable at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me? I should like to address myself to the question which was asked a moment ago.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the Senator from Kansas is anxious to know what rate will be paid for various types of land in his State. The answer to that question is that the fair rental rate will be paid. In the case of some of the land, it may be 25 cents an acre; in the

case of some of the land it may be \$2.25 an acre. That will depend on the rental factors related to that land.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, after expressing the hope that in the dryland States there is some grazing land that is worth \$2.25 an acre. In my State we have some; but I have been told that if the native range land areas have land that has a value of \$1 a year, it is very good grazing land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not intend to state that \$2.25 or \$1.25, either, was the value. I merely intended to state that the value would be the fair rental value.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Texas is correct. The value will be the fair rental value either for full grazing, or, if limited grazing is all that is required in order to meet the need in the case of the particular land, then that value will be fixed, which of course will be less than the total grazing rental value.

Mr. CARLSON. In the blue stem region in Kansas we have some land on which they are receiving agricultural conservation payments of \$1.75 an acre. There is no question that under the conservation program, payments going as high as \$1.65 an acre have been received.

Unless this program is carried out on the basis of the agricultural conservation program I think it would result in great confusion and in some instances in an injustice to the landowner.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to say to the distinguished Senator that one of the changes made by the committee, in its amendment—which probably was not necessary, and probably would have been made anyway—was to provide that this program shall be supplemental to the normal conservation program, and shall be administered by the same group.

So if the distinguished Senator has found that group willing to fix a value as high as the one he has stated for excellent grazing lands in his State, all I can say to him is that the same group will be dealing with the drought situation in his State, which may or may not apply to the same preferred grazing lands.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. At the outset, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida for his explanation of the bill; and I wish to say that in my judgment he has improved the bill considerably from its condition at the time when I appeared before the committee and made a suggestion in reference to the use of the Federal land in the Western States.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, but I have not quite finished the explanation of the bill. I may say to him that we certainly took full cognizance of the suggestion made by the Senator. If he has had a chance to read the report, and if he will bear with me so that I may complete my opening statement, he will find we have made complete allowance for

the point which he so ably made before our committee.

Mr. BARRETT. I shall be glad to yield, but I have read the report and have studied the matter very carefully. I am fearful the committee has not protected us adequately, and I wish to discuss that point with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to discuss it. If the Senator will wait until I read the second paragraph following the point where I stopped a moment ago I shall come to the point he has made, and I shall then yield.

Continuing with my opening statement:

The committee amendment makes it clear that the program would be restricted to nonfederally owned land.

I call to the attention of the Senator from Wyoming the fact that we are beginning to deal with federally and nonfederally owned land. I repeat, the committee amendment makes it clear that the program would be restricted to nonfederally owned land. The Departments administering public lands have adequate authority to deal with the conservation of such lands. Indian lands, in which the Government does not have the beneficial ownership, would, of course, be eligible for the program.

In the case of Indian lands, while the title is held in the Government, the equity is really in the Indian users.

Continuing, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], in testifying before the subcommittee, ably pointed out the desirability of some provision to protect farmers and ranchers participating in the program from the permanent loss of their permits to graze on public lands.

The committee considered this problem and ascertained that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior have authority to enter into nonuse arrangements with grazing permittees whose base properties are, in whole or in part, placed in the program, and thus preserve the qualifications of such properties for grazing permits. The committee report recommends that this be done, and the committee felt that no further provision was necessary to take care of this problem.

Now I yield to my friend from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I appreciate the statement the distinguished Senator has just made. I am concerned with the language in the report, on page 2, at the end of the first paragraph, which I now read:

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture should—

And I emphasize the word "should"—enter into nonuse arrangements with grazing permittees whose base properties are, in whole or in part, placed in the program in order to preserve the qualifications of such properties for grazing permits.

It seems to me the committee should have used the word "shall" instead of "should."

I take it, from the statement the distinguished Senator has just made that, it was the intention of the committee to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to take into consideration the fact that a permittee



has entered into an agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture to cut down his herd or to dispose of his herd completely. Accordingly the rancher could use the Federal lands only partially if at all.

As I explained, a man may own base property, sufficient to run 100 head of cattle. He may have an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior whereby he can run 100 head of cattle on Taylor land a part of the year and a permit with the Secretary of Agriculture to run the same 100 head of cattle on Forest Reserve for another part of the year.

My question is this. Surely if he reduces his herd by say 50 percent on his basic land the Secretary will not penalize him for not running the full number on the Federal lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The committee so understands, and we were in conference with the various representatives of the Department of Agriculture who have charge of that particular activity. Both the committee and the officials understand the situation clearly.

It is rather hard to state, in a fixed way, what will happen, because the whole program will be variable. One man's land will be deferred entirely. Another man's land will be partly deferred, and partly not deferred. Another will have his land subjected to limited uses. The different situations will require different reductions in the size of the herd, and different situations will result. We thought it was adequate to say, and I shall be glad to amplify it for the RECORD, that it is the committee's clear intention and full belief that the affected agency, whether it is in the Department of Agriculture or in the Department of the Interior, should and will see that a fair handling of this matter shall operate so as to protect completely the holder of any permit or lease from the Government affecting public lands, so that he will not be penalized by reason of only partial use of the lands, or even nonuse of the lands, if the problem is such a drastic one in his particular case.

Mr. BARRETT. I appreciate the statement the Senator has just made. I take it that it is the intention of the committee to permit the appropriate agency or the Department of the Interior to handle the leases or the permits in such a fashion that the man who complies with the provision of the law will not be prejudiced in any way because of partial use or nonuse of the Federal land.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly right. We felt that any other conclusion would be completely unreasonable. Here is a government, interested in the restoration of land for the Nation's good, proposing a program. If one of the citizens who is very badly hurt by a prolonged drought, which is a major disaster, brings his own land, necessarily or wisely, or both, under this program, and if he has, as a supplement to his own land, which is his base operation, grazing leases on public land, we certainly do not want him to be hurt in any way. It would be inconceivable that the same government should then penalize him because of his inability to fully graze the lands which belonged to

the public when that inability results from both the disaster and from his entering into the program which his government provides to overcome the disaster to the extent it may be overcome.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. I have a few other questions.

First, I should like to ask the Senator about the limited-use program. Let me state the case in this fashion: Suppose a man owns 10,000 acres of grazing land, the normal capacity of which is such that, let us say, 200 head of cattle could be grazed on the land. The drought has been of such character that the man is obliged to cut his herd down to 150 head of cattle. Do I understand correctly that the man could use the entire 10,000 acres to run 150 head of cattle, and thereby comply with the provision here, let us say, for a 25-percent payment, provided, of course, it was approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and his committees?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not at all an expert in this field, but that was not my understanding. My understanding from the comments made by the agents of the Department of Agriculture, who sat with us, was this: Let us assume we are considering a large ranch, much of which is denuded, which is in such shape it is going to take a period of years to bring back the grass. Suppose, running through the ranch, there is bottom land which is not so denuded of grass and on which it would be idle or foolish to stop grazing entirely. Suppose the grass there is available on a full-time basis, or suppose it is available on a part-time basis, as the facts themselves may indicate. It is my understanding that the use of the words "limited use"—which are in the bill at the suggestion and I might say insistence of the agents of the Department of Agriculture, who sat with us—was to cover cases where the land is not identical throughout its entire extent, but is of different character, or grade, and thus calls for different treatment.

I would much prefer to have one of the Senators on the committee who comes from the arid lands comment on this matter, because he may have a sounder idea about it than I have. My idea is as I have stated.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I should like to make another comment. This is a very important matter so far as the West is concerned. Our opportunities to participate in this program are extremely limited, in my opinion.

I have talked to Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Bradley, of the Department of Agriculture, and their interpretation of that language was as I have just explained it. If the committee intends that limited use shall apply to specific lands, it will be almost impossible for any livestock man in the West to comply with this provision of the law.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. It is on that particular phase of the matter that I desire to make a comment.

Usually the range, consisting of many thousand acres, is not fenced, and a man could not afford to fence it if he wished to.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct.

Mr. THYE. For that reason a problem is presented. There may be some draws or hollows, as the distinguished Senator from Florida has mentioned, which would permit a small percentage of the normal herd to graze on the vast area, which would support the entire herd if there were normal rainfall and a good stand of grass.

The problem with which we are confronted here is that it is not possible to take all the cattle off the range, because then we would be wiping out the foundation stock of cattle which might exist there. Therefore, it would only be practical to limit the grazing.

The cattle themselves would select the area to be grazed, because an animal is quite wise when it is looking for forage or grass. It will go where the grass is. It will not be found on the dry knolls. So the cattle would naturally migrate to the water pockets or waterholes or lowlands where the grazing is possible. That would permit the tufts of grass out on the higher ground to go to seed, and the seed would naturally fall and be there to regerminate and grow grass on the area which had been long denuded of any forage because of drought.

So there is a commonsense solution to the question involved here. If the farmer were limited to a certain percentage of the number of head of cattle which the area normally could carry, just in order to keep the foundation herds intact, a man would not be completely destroyed, and when the grass came back after 1, 2, or 3 years he could make another start.

There has been good moisture in the areas in the States where there was such a problem, and it is very possible that the drought is completely broken. However, there are no plants on a vast acreage of that land. There are a few tufts of grass here and there. There is a large root system that may come to life, but it will take several years before that vast area is again in grass which will permit a man to graze the number of cattle he had when there was normal rainfall.

The whole problem here is one of taking a commonsense approach, in an attempt to limit the cattle and at the same time compensate the man for loss of the vast acreage—upon which he is paying taxes—that he is supervising, or from which he is attempting to earn a livelihood. We should try to compensate him for the fact that there has been no grazing on that area, and then make sure that when the grass has reestablished itself there will be a foundation herd there which will rebuild the livestock industry of the vast Plains area, whence most of the feeder cattle come to fill up the feed lots in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and all other States where we grow corn and are accustomed to feeding cattle.

I support the proposed legislation, because I think it is the only commonsense way by which we can afford any immedi-



ate relief to the vast Plains area and at the same time keep the Plains from being overstocked, preventing the destruction of every plant before it has a chance to go to seed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the very practical and very wise remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. His experience is not new to me. I have discovered that in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he frequently demonstrates his knowledge derived from his long acquaintance with agriculture. I believe the Senator from Minnesota served as a commissioner of agriculture in his own State. He knows agriculture in the West and the Middle West up and down. He has certainly made an important contribution to the discussion of this bill.

Before leaving the item we have been considering I may say that while I am sorry I cannot put into the RECORD the memorandum we have from the Department, I wish to state it was drawn up under the best circumstances possible, taking into account the haste required in this matter. Though it does not bear the signature of the Secretary, it does constitute the considered judgment of the officials of the Department who sat with us during several conferences. I believe there were three conferences.

This is what is said as to that particular point, and I quote this, because I think it is pertinent for the RECORD:

The original bill provided for deferred grazing only. The amended version would provide opportunity for better grassland management and utilization through non-use, limited use, deferred grazing during the period of plant growth, or any needed combination thereof.

I suspect that is about as fair a statement as could be made, briefly, on the matter.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I have another question to ask the Senator along the same line, if he will permit.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask the Senator if it is the intention of the committee to permit a livestock operator to qualify who has already limited his herds or completely disposed of his herds because of the drought in previous years.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is the opinion of the Senator from Florida that it is certainly the intention of the committee in such a case, where the man has already suffered the maximum disaster possible from the drought, to give him a chance to bring his lands back into shape.

Mr. BARRETT. Assuming that a man is required to ship his cattle out of the State for feeding purposes for a winter—or we shall say for 6 months—and does not use his base ranch properties at all, would that be a compliance, in the opinion of the distinguished Senator?

Mr. HOLLAND. If he does not overgraze the lands where they are put, he could certainly be held to comply by following that process.

Mr. BARRETT. He has not reduced his herd, but he has taken his entire herd off the range for half the year. I assume that would amount to the same thing as a 50 percent reduction, for that year, at any rate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Again, let me say that the Senator from Florida does not possess the very close knowledge which other Senators possess of actual operations in the great and fine area of the country affected by drought. He would not like to state his opinion as being the final word. His idea has been that this provision would apply in a situation in which the farmer is in distress and the condition of his land has forced a reduction of grazing on the land. He may reduce his herd or move it elsewhere. If that is not the correct explanation, I should like to be corrected. I see my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] still in the Chamber. I see other Senators from that great and fine area of the country, who know much more about the subject than I do. As I understand, this is not a program to enable a farmer to maintain full operation, full steam ahead. He will have to reduce his cattle numbers or find other grazing or feed for them.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming spoke about taking a herd off the range for half the season, or half of the year. That is a possibility. Frequently in the dry plains area it is possible to cut a crop of native hay only every other year. If the amount of rainfall is limited it must be allowed to stand and develop a root system, and come back the second season, if there is to be actual growth. If grazing were continued for the entire 12 months of the year, the grass, growing slowly as it does, would be kept down to the root. The vitality of the plant would constantly be weak, and its growth would be so limited that there would be little opportunity for the prairie land to hold itself against ruination. If the cattle are removed from the range for 6 months, there is a reestablishment of the grass. It develops a firmer root section. There is more vitality in the plant, and the plant is safeguarded against ruination, or an absolute kill.

I think the Senator from Wyoming is correct in asking these questions, because only here do we establish the legislative history of the bill, so that the solicitor may be guided by it when he is endeavoring to place an interpretation upon the intent of the entire act.

In asking these questions the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is establishing the legislative history. I think there is commonsense to the idea that a rancher may move his cattle off the range for 6 months at a time. Whether he puts them in a lot for feeding on dry feed is a question to be determined. But if they are off the range for 6 months, the grass will have greater vitality, and will definitely show improvement, even under drought conditions.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is quite possible that if grazing were available in a distant State, or at some other place, sufficient to support the entire herd, the procedure suggested by the Senator from Wyoming might be applicable.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. One reason I made mention of the fact that the cattle might be removed from the drought area for a period of time is that in the drought of 1934, and again in 1936—but primarily the 1934 drought, which was severe in much of the plains area—many truckloads of cattle were hauled from the plains area to northern Minnesota, because the grazing in the woods area was ample to furnish feed. Thereby herds of cattle were kept from complete extinction. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. What the Senator from Minnesota has described is common practice in the years when we have extreme drought in the West. I hope it is the intention of the committee that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, in administering the provisions of the bill, will take into consideration all these factors in arriving at the regulations, so as to give the people of the West an opportunity to participate in the benefits of the bill, if it shall become law.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Secretary of Agriculture will be administering the act. I am sure that the Senator, in referring to the Secretary of the Interior, is speaking only of that portion of the public lands over which the Secretary of the Interior has jurisdiction.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I agreed to yield to the Senator from Illinois next.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to understand the bill. Am I correct in my understanding that the bill provides for Federal subsidies to cattle growers and sheep raisers, so that they will not overgraze their land when the land has been damaged by drought?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; with one addition, namely, that it must have been so gravely damaged by drought that the area would have been declared a disaster area under the provisions of Public Law 875.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I further correct in my understanding that the Department of Agriculture estimates that the cost of a 2-year program of this nature will be approximately \$30 million?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Department of Agriculture has furnished us that figure, and we have included it in our statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he has any fears that the proposed legislation would undermine the initiative and self-reliance of the cattle growers and sheep raisers in this area?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not, because I have found them to be about the most independent and resourceful group of agriculturists in the Nation. In the course of our hearing 2 years ago on price-support legislation, even in those areas where most of the tillers of the land were for high price supports, without a single exception at any hearing the Senator from Florida attended, the cattlemen came forward and very finally



and vociferously stated that they wanted no part of any price supports.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois remembers that very well. He remembers that the cattlemen of the West, and of the Great Plains area, objected to any protection of consumers, on the ground that if that were done it would undermine the independence and self-reliance of the cattlemen. I wonder if the Senator has discovered the same zeal for independence and self-reliance on the part of the cattlemen when it comes to a Government subsidy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Very few cattlemen appeared before us on the pending measure. We heard witnesses from the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, and many other agencies. They assured us that this was the greatest drought disaster that had befallen a large area of our Nation in the history of the Weather Bureau. Unless means are provided to combat the disaster, we shall not only find some good people out of business, which would be deplorable enough, but we shall find great areas of our country denuded and unproductive. The feeling in our committee was unanimous. I do not recall that any objection was raised. Some of us come from States where, thank the Lord, we do not have this particular problem to contend with. We felt that an important issue of conservation affecting the natural resources of our country far transcended the personal interest of any user of grazing land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the Senator from Illinois intends to vote for the bill as presented by the chairman of the subcommittee. However, in view of the fact that cattlemen and sheepraisers have insisted so strongly on protecting their independence and self-reliance and individual initiative, I wondered whether the Senator from Florida had any fear that we would undermine the independence upon which the cattlemen have insisted so strongly. I say that because initiative can be undermined in a very insidious fashion. A program may begin with very laudable purposes. However, if we destroy, ultimately, both self-reliance and initiative, as we heard the cattlemen say so many times might happen under certain circumstances, would not the consequences of such action be disastrous? I wonder whether the Senator from Florida and the cattlemen themselves have thought enough about the possibility or danger of undermining the moral qualities of the cattlemen.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to my friend from Illinois, in good humor, because he always preserves good humor, that I do not believe that such a result would come about in this instance. We are confronted with a great national disaster. It is just as much a national disaster as is a ravaging flood or a great fire or a great earthquake. We are trying to deal with it from that point of view. I may say also that most of the agricultural industries which I represent in part as one of two Senators from the State of Florida are just as strongly against price supports as are the cattlemen. I refer to the fruit growers and vegetable growers in my State. With one voice, everyone whom I have heard speak on the subject has said, "Here is

a disaster so tremendous that only the Nation, with all its strength, can help relieve it." Therefore I do not believe the cattlemen would be affected at all in their traditional feeling and point of view against price supports.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator does not believe that their character would be undermined?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think the character of the cattlemen would be undermined any more than a home lover would have his character undermined if his home had been washed away by a flood and the Red Cross or some governmental agency had come forward to help him reestablish his little home. I do not believe his character would be undermined by restoring the home of his little family. To the contrary I believe he would show considerable intestinal fortitude by coming back to restore his home. When victims of drought can see the well-watered plains of Illinois not far away, or the verdant fields of Florida or California not far away, and other places which have not been hit by terrific drought disasters, there is a temptation, I am sure, for one who is weak to say, "This is all I can take. Let me go to Illinois or to Florida or to California, or somewhere else, and rebuild in a safer and more secure agricultural atmosphere."

I believe that the people who are fighting for their very lives in this situation are deeply attached to the soil and are deeply attached to the cattle industry, and are deeply attached to independence, and would not think that they were losing their independence by letting their great Government help them retain their land. I did not find such sentiments expressed, or any such great concern expressed, by anyone who appeared before us in our hearings.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very much reassured by the statement of the Senator from Florida. I am very glad to hear that our stockmen feel that way about this proposal. As I say, I shall vote for the bill. Of course, the Senator from Florida realizes that catastrophes are not solely natural catastrophes, and that there are also social catastrophes as well as climatic catastrophes. I imagine that the Senator from Florida believes, therefore, that people should be protected against such things as urban blights, and that character is not destroyed by the Federal Government assisting people who are injured by calamities aside from those of nature.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, correct. From the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee over which the Senator from Florida has the responsibility and honor of presiding as chairman, there has come each year for several years a provision of funds more generous than that provided by the other body in its wisdom, for the redevelopment of areas that had been hurt by some situation outside of their ability to control, but not of a serious natural nature.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the Senator's statement. May I ask whether the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the program?

Mr. HOLLAND. That I am unable to answer categorically. Let me say that before the distinguished Senator came to the Chamber I explained to the Senate that we had had specialists and experts and heads of divisions of the Department of Agriculture sit with us on three occasions. They have been very helpful, and the changes which are reflected in the committee amendment largely reflect the suggestions and the wisdom of those people.

We also received this morning an informal memorandum. It does not have the standing of a report, because it had not had time to clear through the Department. At the same time I feel that the memorandum, from which I have quoted several paragraphs, does represent the thinking of the heads of those divisions in the Department of Agriculture who sat with us in drafting and later when we had worked out the bill, and who, after a couple of days in which to study the language more carefully, wrote the memorandum as representing their reflections. They are all complimentary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Agriculture at a press conference a few days ago criticized the idea of price supports for farm products. His basic objection, of course, is that they undermine the independence of the farmer in his reliance on such programs. Am I to understand that the Secretary of Agriculture does not have the same objections to subsidy payments for stockmen and sheep raisers?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry to say that I am unable to answer that question. However, I must say that the Secretary of Agriculture is not alone in his feeling that reliance on high price supports has, in some instances, sapped the independence and self-reliance and initiative of some of our farmers. No one regrets that more than does the Senator from Florida, who dislikes to see it. There are some things, entirely proper, which we can do that will not entail such an unfortunate result. However, I believe that we have had just such an unfortunate result from some aspects of the very high price-support program which was allowed to follow the war.

My opinion and the opinion of the Senator from Illinois are not always the same, although we are equally interested in agriculture and agriculturalists. I am sure that the Senator from Illinois is an ardent patriot and wants to bring good to all the people of his country. The Senator from Florida shares that attitude also.

Therefore, there can be differences of opinion on some of these subjects, but I am sure we think alike when we try to deal with a terrible national disaster which not only affects hundreds of our people disadvantageously but, if carried to the extreme, might conceivably destroy the effective productiveness of our land and thus diminish our national strength.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the kind words the Senator from Florida has said about the Senator from Illinois, and I wish to reciprocate those feelings so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned.



Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida and the Secretary of Agriculture are alert to the dangers of natural catastrophes such as drought. However, are there not some catastrophes which hit millions of city people, which disasters are not caused by nature, and to avert which the individual city dweller is as helpless as is a stockman or cattleman to avert natural disasters?

Mr. HOLLAND. There are certainly disasters of one kind or another which hit us that are not natural disasters. The Senator from Illinois offered some words of commendation to the Senator from Florida when he was handling a measure to liberalize greatly the Farmers' Home Administration Act by trying to meet the situation, in part, at least, of farmers of limited means or farmers who were farming submarginal land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida is very kind. I hope he will permit the Senator from Illinois to ask one more question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The cattlemen and stockmen from these regions have constantly emphasized what they term "States rights." They say that the Federal Government should not intrude upon the States in matters relating to the States. They say that the States should assume the major portion of economic activity, and that the Federal Government should, in the main, stay on the sidelines. Does the Senator from Florida feel that States' rights are being interfered with by these Federal subsidies?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not feel that States' rights are being interfered with at all by the measure we are here considering. On the contrary, I think the States where the massive droughts have been sustained are already carrying, so far as the public units are concerned, the greatest part of the load. There is no way to avoid that. The tax rolls show it; their volume of business shows it.

There is not a State institution in any State which has been terribly hit by the drought which has not been badly hurt. Therefore, the States will have to carry the principal part of the load. Nevertheless, all the States help to make up our great Federal Government, and one of the fine things about the Federal Government is that both officially and unofficially, through governmental means and through such private means as the Red Cross, and many similar agencies, the people of America like to think of themselves as united when disaster strikes any part of our Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate those remarks. I am in favor of the grazing bill. I want to make that perfectly clear.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois; I thought he would be in favor of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am struck by the fact that the people recognize the force of the Federal Government when they are in trouble and when they want an appropriation. But when it is a question of the Federal Government protecting

someone else and possibly interfering with them a little, then some of the same people take refuge in the doctrine of States' rights and say, "This is not a proper function of the Federal Government." The endeavor of the Senator from Illinois, as undoubtedly the Senator from Florida has discerned, has been to make certain that there is as much consistency in this field as is perhaps desirable.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois, as always, has been courteous and kind in his remarks concerning this matter. I should like him to realize that, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, there is not an acre in his State—and I am happy that that is the case—which would be affected by the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I found no disposition on the part of any Senator on our committee from a State which was not hit by this disaster to fail to give all his attention, thoughts, and planning to trying to draft a workable bill.

I do not believe there any one who desires to put disaster relief, whether Federal or State, as to the individual, on a strict, technical basis of States' rights or individual rights.

So far as I am concerned, I think I am about as ardent an advocate of States' rights, along with State responsibilities, as can be found in the Senate. I hope to be so. Yet I find no trouble at all, either for myself or from my State, which is not affected, in doing the utmost toward trying to have passed a workable bill for some 8, 10, or 12 States which are affected in varying degrees, and which are a great part of our fine country, and which will be left in a desperate position unless some program is provided for rebuilding the fertility of their soil.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree with the Senator from Florida. There have been some droughts in southern Illinois, and I think some counties should have been declared disaster areas which were not declared to be disaster areas. In the main, of course, my State has not suffered to the degree the Western States have suffered. Nevertheless, I am very glad to support the proposed legislation, because I think it is needed. It is needed to prevent the Dust Bowl from developing once again.

My hope is that the citizens and the representatives of those States that desire Federal aid when they suffer natural catastrophes will realize that other sections of the country can suffer not merely natural, but also manmade catastrophes, which are equally devastating in their total effect.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. He is always a real humanitarian. I never expected anything else than that he would be strongly in support of the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for the very able presentation he has made, although he does not come from the drought areas of the Nation.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois, genuine humanitarian that he is, was, I think, justified in putting his question about what would be done with respect to other sections of the country which may not be stricken with a drought, but which may sustain some economic catastrophe.

Coming as I do from a drought-stricken area, he may rest assured that I will support all such measures, because we are not talking about cattle, we are not talking about land, but we are talking about people. As the distinguished Senator from Florida has said, it is the people who are suffering.

I should like to inform the Senator from Florida and other Members of this body that only recently this very area was in the midst of a triple blizzard. For 7 years the people of this area have suffered from hailstorms, or from wind, or from the sun which has dried out their land. Now, at this very point, there comes before us a very minor bill, a grazing bill, a part of the purpose of which, as I understand, is to extend the provisions of Public Law 875, which is disaster legislation which the President himself can activate only if, in turn, the governor of a State activates it.

Heretofore Colorado has had 36 counties under the disaster program. As a result of the recent blizzards, 10 additional counties have been added.

Cattlemen, whose basic herds may have been smothered by the snow, are not asking for grants of money; they are simply asking that the Government not foreclose, but extend credit to them. That is what first brought my attention to the deferred grazing bill.

It is very clear to me what the purpose of the bill is. Although it deal with the conservation of grass and of land, it fundamentally deals with people. At a very insignificant cost it will be most helpful to the Nation.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for his clear presentation, at the same time recognizing that the distinguished Senator from Illinois was using a little of the needling process to awaken our own consciences to the facts which may exist in the other parts of the Nation.

The Senator from Illinois has said he will support the bill. For that we commend him. I do not see how any Senator could, in good conscience, vote against the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has not felt that the needling on the part of the Senator from Illinois was at all unkind.

Before I close this part of the discussion, I call attention to one other matter. My friend, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], is really the chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings. He was so burdened with other hearings that he asked the Senator from Florida, who is one of its members, to act in his place. The Senator from Florida is the chairman of another subcommittee which is somewhat related to this subcommittee. The Senator from Florida agreed to conduct the hearings as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.



When the time came to make a report on the bill, the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida, who sometimes do not see eye to eye on the subject of price supports, were going down the road hand in hand. Neither of our States is affected at all by the drought. Nevertheless, although our philosophy about price supports is as different as it can be, I do not believe there was any expression of difference about the details of the bill. Certainly, we were both found supporting it heartily in every way we could.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for the remarks and references he has made concerning me. When I was looking for a Senator to hold the hearings, I immediately thought of the Senator from Florida, knowing that he would go to the bottom of the matter and develop all the necessary facts in order to reach a proper conclusion. I had no doubt in my mind that the proposed legislation was needed, and that the Senator from Florida would do the spade work of digging out the facts and getting the bill ready, not only for the subcommittee, but also for the full committee.

I commend him for the work he has done, because he and his committee have produced an excellent bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say, if the Senator from Florida will permit me, apropos of the debate between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Florida, that one of the things about which the livestock men have complained, although not very loud, has been not the failure of Congress, but the holding of the prices of feed—corn, barley, and other feed—at a support price higher than that for which it can be fed to the livestock, the livestock can be sold on the open market, and the cattle-men can break even.

CANNOT FEED THE CORN, BARLEY, AND OIL CAKE  
AT SUPPORT PRICE AND SELL STEERS ON OPEN  
MARKET

If the support price is paid for corn, and fed to the steers, there will be a loss of about 50 cents a day on each steer sold on the open market even if they make the usual gains.

The cattle and sheep men have taken the brunt of it for several years, and it has broken a lot of feeders, and the feeders furnish the market for the small ranchers and the farmers, when their livestock is ready to ship off the range.

When certain areas are placed in a disaster area, a special price is established for the feed, (corn, barley and oil cake) and that reduces the cost to a point where the farmers and ranchers can at least break even, by feeding the corn and the barley at such reduced prices.

That operation alone however, disturbs the business where it is not dependable.

Mr. HOLLAND. And by cutting the herd to the basic herd.

Mr. MALONE. I may add, by cutting the basic herds and borrowing money to feed the cattle for the market.

They have just about reached their limit however, in trying to feed corn, barley and oil cake at the support price, when there is no support price for the cattle. So far they have stayed away from it and argued against it, but the end is near.

As the distinguished Senator from Florida has so ably stated, they have been very vociferous in stating that they want no help, or regulation; but some of these days they will come to the end of the rope, if the Congress continues to keep up the support price of the feed they must have to market the beef.

#### ARBITRARY REDUCTION OF THE RANGE PART OF THE LIVESTOCK UNIT

Let me explain to the distinguished Senator from Florida the tendency on the part of both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior to reduce the range for the livestock unit 10 percent on transfer or non-use.

The Department of Agriculture supervises the forest reserves which generally are the summer grazing areas, because they are the higher elevation areas on the western ranges; and the Department of the Interior supervises the regular public land areas under the Taylor Grazing Act, initiated in 1934 and now under the Bureau of Land Management. There has been a tendency to cut the grazing rights of any grazer who may have more than what they call a subsistence unit—enough for an average family.

I wish to explain to the distinguished Senator from Florida, inasmuch as I know that the areas in his State are entirely different from the western areas, that what counts in the West is the balancing of the range with the feed producing ranches.

There are three parts to a grazing unit. First, there is the feed-producing ranch area, where there is enough water to raise hay or grain or both to feed a certain number of cow units—cow and calf—or sheep units—ewe and lamb. A ton of hay to a cow or unit is about the average in the West, for wintering a cow unit.

Then there are the spring, fall, summer and winter range lands—public or privately owned lands which form one part of the 3-part unit. The water rights on the range and the feed-producing ranches form the third unit. If any part is taken away or reduced, to that extent the carrying capacity of the range unit is destroyed.

So the tendency has been to cut 10 percent, whenever there is a transfer, or whenever there arises an occasion for so doing. The authority to do this has never been relinquished so that the "range unit" is never stable or salable.

I wish to refer to page 2 of the report, where the language is very clear—namely, that—

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture should enter into nonuse arrangements with grazing permittees whose base properties are, in whole or

in part, placed in the program in order to preserve the qualifications of such properties for grazing permits.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if there is an understanding with the Government Department in charge of the public lands that there will be no arbitrary cut in the range affecting the carrying capacity of these range units, during this period.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Nevada that the various agencies which handle the programs for the public lands and the leasing of those lands to the permittees, were consulted by the committee about this matter. They say that ample authority already exists, and I think that they certainly should insist upon the handling of their present regulations under their present authority in such a way as to work no hardship or forfeiture upon the holders of permits who graze the public lands supplemental to their own lands, as the Senator has explained the matter.

Mr. MALONE. If the distinguished Senator from Florida will permit me to continue, I wish to say that I know they have that authority. They also have authority under certain conditions to cut the range under lease 10 percent on sale of transfers; and what we need to know now, Have they committed themselves to protect such range utilized with the livestock unit during this period?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the understanding of the Senator from Florida and the committee. While the Government is with one hand extending aid to a rancher to revitalize his land in its productive capacity, it would be completely inconsistent for the Government with the other hand to take away some right that was based upon the rancher's full herd being in existence and being grazed. When the farmer has to limit grazing he simply cannot live up to the full requirements of his grazing permit as to how many head he would have on the publicly leased part of his total grazing facilities.

#### STATES RIGHTS

Mr. MALONE. I appreciate very much the statement of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

I should like to add—because the matter of States' rights has been brought into the debate—that in my opinion the States' rights are in no way affected one way or another by any action which Congress may take in connection with any relief or any other projects under a congressional policy, such as that of flood control of irrigation or reclamation, drainage or through appropriating money for other purposes.

The States' rights are not affected in any way whatever, unless by deliberate action taken by an administration or by a bureau head operating under the laws so passed, and taking advantage of such congressional action. The bureau heads are only empowered to conform to the policy laid down by Congress, not to create policy.

Congress is not taking away or affecting the States' rights by such action. But unfortunately for many years the policy of encroaching upon States' rights



has been a policy of bureau heads and of administrative action.

I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Florida will agree with me that the harm is not done by the laws passed by Congress to carry out projects within a State or States, but the harm is done by the bureau heads who operate to establish policies which usurp and nullify such constitutional rights of the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator from Nevada and I understand the matter exactly alike. I think the Congress passes legislation of that type in an effort to increase the national wealth and the national productivity. The Congress is not thinking of any particular individual or any particular groups of individuals. The purpose is to build greater wealth and greater productive power for the Nation. When a disaster comes and when there is necessity for giving relief, I think all that the Congress endeavors to do in regard to the citizens and the communities and the States affected is to enable them to receive aid from their other brethren who happen to live in places which are not affected by such disasters.

Mr. MALONE. Then I understand the Senator from Florida agrees with me that when Congress passes an act for relief that action has nothing to do with basic States' rights under the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at all, any more than it tends to destroy personal or States' rights when the Senator out of his generosity makes a donation to the Red Cross at a time of disaster, when he wishes to have relief given to someone or some area which has been greatly hurt by a flood or some other disaster. That is not a deprivation of rights. To the contrary, it is a showing of interest on the part of one American in the distress of other Americans who happen to be adversely affected.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORRISON in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Florida inform me whether I am correct in understanding that this is a special bill to provide special aid for livestock grazers, and will make available for their help the sum of \$25 million if they qualify in accordance with the provisions of the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. When the Senator from Ohio refers to \$25 million he refers to the special message of the President, which has been printed as House Document 115. He will find it printed on page 19 of that document. The \$25 million is requested this year as a first appropriation.

The Department of Agriculture, in its report to us, says—and I have not quite reached that part of my introductory remarks—that this program, as embraced in this measure, will cost, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture, ap-

proximately \$30 million for the next 2 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the next 2 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it is a special bill to provide special aid for a special condition, apart from all of the other bills we have to give aid in a disaster?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Secondly, House bill 4249 was passed early in this session, and that gave \$25 million to the same cattle growers, for the purpose of aiding them in buying feed.

My question is, Was that not a special bill to give special aid in a special condition, and does not the bill which we have before the Senate today cover the same situation?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct in that that special measure was to give assistance to largely the same group of people that would be affected by the pending measure; but it had to do with emergency feed assistance, allowing them to buy emergency feeds at 50 percent of normal value. That was in pursuance of a program which has been operating several years. This particular appropriation was recommended and passed by the Senate as a part of the urgent deficiency bill of 1957. That bill is still in conference. It had to do with providing funds to carry on one of the programs that is embraced in a general public relief act, which I believe is known as Public Law 875.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is also my understanding that there is under way between the conference committees of the House and the Senate the working out of an arrangement whereby the deficiency bill will become law, and that one of the vital arguments in the consideration of that proposal deals with the \$25 million appropriated by the Senate for cattle growers several months ago.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is partly right in his statement. The matter is in conference. I understand it is in trouble. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is on the floor. He is one of the conferees. He could tell us of the situation. The bill deals with emergency feed. It is feared that the bill might have an effect upon dairymen, poultrymen, and other producers, in disturbing the normal prices at which they buy commodities necessary to them, and which are also furnished in the feed program. However, that bill has no relation whatever to the pending bill.

I may say that the pending bill contained a section, section 5, which would have amended Public Law 38, 81st Congress, or that part of it which dealt with the feed program, but it was dropped, for the reason that the House had dropped a similar provision out of H. R. 2367 and plans to hold hearings on the subject. We consulted with the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the author of the bill, and came to the conclusion with him that section 5 would better be considered as separate legislation so that action on a deferred grazing would not be delayed.

The pending bill has to do with providing needed range grass growth on

many millions of acres of rangeland, lying in from 8 to 12 States. I have to put it that way because recent rains and snows may bring quicker relief to some of those States than was at first thought possible. But the bill affects a great area of our country, and has to do with the rehabilitation of a native asset, the growth on rangeland, which at present is not allowed for under any effective public program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say one thing more. The \$25 million which the Senator mentions, in other words, has no application at all to this program. The best measure we have as to the cost of this program, and the only measure on which we can rely, is the estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture that it will cost \$30 million, as he sees it now, to carry the program on for 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the chairman of the committee, who is also one of the conferees on the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have just returned from a conference between the House and the Senate on the urgent deficiency bill. We have been struggling in conference with this problem for the past 3½ weeks. The \$25 million figure mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Ohio was not agreed upon by the House, but, instead, we accepted a \$15 million appropriation. The reason for that was that the \$15 million appropriation would be sufficient to carry out the program until June 30, whereas the Senate had provided \$25 million to carry out the program until September 30, 1957.

Likewise, the Senate receded from the \$25 million figure and agreed to accept the \$15 million figure from the disaster loan revolving fund, to be used for emergency feed and seed assistance.

We have not reached agreement on the question of forcing the Secretary of Agriculture to assist farmers in procuring cottonseed meal or cottonseed cake or pellets for taking care of basic herds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield so that the Senator from Ohio may ask a question and receive an answer from the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the subject of the \$25 million which was granted to buy feed one of the items in controversy in the conference?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not. Have the conferees agreed upon that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question.

I have had some word that the Secretary of Commerce has stated that if the \$25 million, which was included in the deficiency bill, is granted, this \$15 million a year is unnecessary. Has there been



any such word delivered to the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. No such word has been delivered to the committee, and if it were delivered, it would have to come from an uninformed source, because the two subject matters are completely different. One has to do with the matter of assistance in the furnishing of feed to basic herds to hold them together. The other is the matter of rebuilding the native grass on range lands which have become almost desert, in many areas of the West, as a result of the drought.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When the deficiency bill was before the Senate, if I had known a request was going to be made for \$15 million or more, my vote would not have gone in support of that bill. I understand first there was provided aid for the grazers by way of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which has been in existence. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then we passed a special bill to give \$25 million for them to buy feed. Now we are probably going to pass a \$15 million bill to help them reestablish their lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is partly right and partly wrong. The aid for feed covers a much wider area than does the pending bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are they not both administered under the public-disaster law? They come under the same subject, do they not?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct; however, under different phases of that law. Insofar as concerns aid for feed, the right to purchase feed at 50 percent of normal cost applies to a much wider area than that to which the pending bill would apply, because in the pending bill it is not just required that it shall be a disaster area. There are many disaster areas where farms exist and where farming is in distress. The bill to which the Senator refers is the feed-and-seed bill. The present measure is confined to livestock, and it is also confined to areas in which—and I quote from the bill, and the Senator will find this language on lines 22 and following on page 4—"in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and finds that limited or deferred grazing is necessary and appropriate for the reestablishment or conservation of grass for grazing."

I wish to say to my distinguished friend that the aid-for-feed program has been going on for some years. The Senator from Florida, along with other members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has been on inspection trips, to see how our aid for the acquisition-of-feed program was coming along. Some of that is in areas where, largely, cultivated farmland is involved, rather than rangeland. Some of it is in areas where the extreme drought lasted only 1 year, but where there is a lack of feed and a lack of assets and consequent inability to move ahead.

This bill relates to those vital cases where the native products of the soil—

mostly grass, but other vegetation, also—have been so completely destroyed by the long-existing drought that the very existence of that area as a productive part of our agricultural economy is jeopardized and threatened.

The effort here is to provide for an emergency conservation and reestablishment practice which will enable the rebuilding of the native assets, the range grass and other things.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is one of the ranking members of the committee. Perhaps he has an observation to state on this point.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, if I may be permitted to state it.

There is an item in conference now with the House, as to appropriations, relating to loans to farmers which are to be repaid. The item is for direct payments to the farmers for rehabilitation of rangelands. I think the two are entirely separate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Delaware, with the consent of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Ohio was correct. We did appropriate a few weeks back \$25 million to provide for cheaper feed for this same area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Twenty-five million dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Ohio is correct. Situations will occur under the provisions of the proposed law whereby those who come within the grazing plan will lease grazing facilities to the Government and receive the normal grazing payments from the Government while at the same time the cattle they move off the area will be fed by the Government under another program at about one-half the normal price. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again I may say that is partly correct and partly incorrect. The maintenance of the basic herd, which is a great deal smaller than the full herd, is a matter of public concern, as well as a matter of private concern to the owner. That is protected and allowed for in part by the feed purchase program, to permit the grazer or the dairyman, after he has reduced his herd—and the areas I have helped inspect were more dairy areas than they were rangeland areas—the opportunity to keep life in the bodies of the basic herd, which has been culled out from his full herd. The rest of the cattle are gone.

That is the objective served by the feed program. The question of the preservation or restoration of the land is a different question. The law will be administered, however, by the same agency, and it will be administered with some commonsense.

Whether we like what Mr. Benson and his key men do or not, I think most of us would have to say they have shown a whole lot of good, commonsense and demonstrated a great deal of good, common frugality in the handling of the

main programs. I see no basic interference between these two programs, because they deal with different values.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not questioning the fact that the program contemplated may have some merit; I am merely pointing out that I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is correct. It is possible if the bill is passed to have both programs operating with regard to the same farm simultaneously, where the farmer would be paid to take the herd off his land and would draw full compensation and payment for the acreage, while at the same time the Government would be helping to feed the herd, after the farmer put it off the land. There will be duplication.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Government would be helping him to feed his herd by selling him feed at half price.

After all, does the Senator suggest that we should attempt to replace these millions of acres of rangeland, but not attempt to provide cattle or sheep to go on them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not suggesting that. There may be some merit to this proposal. I am suggesting that the time is long past due when we should have some form of State participation in these programs which provide for Federal aid in the various stages. I say that, regardless of which States may be involved, I will not support this bill as written.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I realize that there is room for a difference of opinion on these matters, but I wish to say that as between the measures, if I had to choose, I would say the national interest is much more concerned with the objectives of the pending bill than even with the wholesome objectives of the aid for feed program for the basic herd, whether it be dairy cattle or range cattle, or whatever it might be. After all, we are dealing with the preservation, protection, and revival of a very great national asset, which is jeopardized and nearing destruction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The grave fear I have about the wisdom of passing the bill deals with a principle. It is my fear that the giving of such aid, as distinct from the general disaster aid which is applied to all, would positively lay the groundwork for cities to come to the Congress asking that their citizens who have suffered losses of houses and property be given special aid for special damages suffered under special conditions.

While I was mayor of Cleveland, the city of Cleveland suffered from tornadoes. While I was governor of Ohio, there were disasters on the Ohio River. The citizens came to me, as governor, and asked if the State could not help them directly in retrieving a part of the losses which they suffered. My answer was that the State could not.

If this bill is passed it will establish the principle that the Federal Government in periods of disaster will give direct aid, whatever the situation may be.



I humbly submit to the Senate that if we give aid to the cattle grazer, how can we deny aid to the miner, or the quarryman, or the railroadman, whose property has been damaged or destroyed in a disaster?

I wish to further point out that this bill provides that at the end of 5 years it shall vanish; that there shall be no further force to the law. Five years from now I shall be here in the Senate, and I venture to say the amount requested will be larger, and there will be a request that the period be extended. The costs of the bill will accumulate, and the tax burden upon the citizenry will grow heavier. I fear passing the bill is not wisdom, because of the dangerous precedent which it establishes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator, the former Governor of Ohio. I have had somewhat similar experiences while serving as the Governor of our State of Florida. We have had hurricanes. We have had floods. We have had other disasters. After I came to the Senate we had a flood in 1947, which the United States engineers said resulted in a loss of \$59 million. I think the loss was a good deal greater than that, but \$59 million was the official figure. We did not come here asking for the restoration of those things which were lost. We did come asking for appropriate relief. We were generously treated by the Congress, which thought that measures which would prevent the recurrence of such a flood, or tend to do so in the future, were desirable from the standpoint not only of protecting individuals, properties, and the State, but particularly from the standpoint of the protection of the Nation, because we cannot take \$59 million out of the productive capacity of a small area in 1 State in 1 year without greatly reducing taxpayments to the Federal Government and other units of government. We came to Congress for the type of relief which was applicable to that type of case.

It seems to me that the Senator is disturbing himself with questions which are not applicable to this situation. If the Senator is prepared to hold that it is not a matter of grave national concern for many millions of acres of lands formerly rich and productive to become almost a desert comparable to the Sahara, displacing hundreds of thousands of people who have not only lived upon those lands, but have raised there commodities needed by the rest of the Nation, of course, his argument is sound. But it seems to the Senator from Florida, and it seemed to every other member of our committee, regardless of where we came from, or to which party we belonged, that this was a matter in which the public good of the United States was threatened by disaster, already grave, but which could possibly become more widespread in its permanent effect, and that instead of sitting still and doing nothing about it, we should at least offer a cooperative hand to the people of the areas so devastated. We should say to them, "Thank the Lord, you want to go back to the land and restore the area to productivity, instead of moving to States which have not

been hurt." We are glad that that is a typical American attitude. The American people do not like to be driven from their homes. They do not like to leave their native heath. They want their children to be reared under the conditions under which they themselves were reared. They will stay where they are and fight, not only for themselves, but for the reestablishment of a great national asset.

The committee felt unanimously that a sufficiently important national question was involved to cause us to recommend strongly the enactment of this legislation, even though it would cost us, as is now estimated, \$30 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I deeply respect the great devotion which the Senator from Florida has to conservation. I cannot see how he could have a different attitude, knowing the great influence which the beauty of Florida naturally has upon him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. We will welcome him as a guest, frequently, I hope.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, while I subscribe to the principle of conservation, and have fought for it diligently, I have in mind that we now have a general law making possible financial aid to the landowner who adopts a conservation program.

That law is uniform in its operation. It covers the entire breadth of the land. It covers every farmer and cattle raiser in the country. Ohio farmers have available to themselves the benefit of that law. But it is now sought to superimpose upon that general law a special law. That is why I disagree as to the wisdom and soundness of the bill before us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Replying rather briefly, let me say that the conservation acreage provisions of the soil-bank law, of course, cover most of the area of the State so ably represented by the Senator from Ohio, because it has a very great percentage of cultivated lands. The conservation acreage provisions are much more generous to the owners of cultivated lands than the provisions of this bill are to the owners of range land. It seems to our committee that we had before us for consideration a group which was left out of the soil bank and out of any other program applicable to cultivated lands, but a group of people who have had visited upon them this terrible disaster. They want to go back and restore the productivity of those lands. They want to rebuild a tremendous national asset. I say, more power to them. I believe that weaker souls would give up and move to the verdant fields of areas which have not been so adversely affected. But these people want to stay on their lands. I say, let us keep them there by treatment which is not only generous to them, but just to our national interest, because a great national interest is involved.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for the wonderful exposition he has made of the situation facing some of the States in the drought area. I come from Oklahoma, which was one of the original dust bowl States. Many people decried the cost which was involved in the rehabilitation of the area where there was churned up dust which swept into Ohio, and even down to Florida and the Gulf of Mexico.

As the Senator from Florida says, the people want to stay with the land. The hardy pioneers who stayed with it restored the native grasses and, through help from the Government, recreated grazing land very much like that which nature had created in the first instance.

During the war years I saw this land supply the meat and the wheat which helped to win the victory, and also to return in ever-increasing abundance the income taxes which paid back manyfold the cost of rescuing that barren land.

As the distinguished Senator from Florida has pointed out, farmers or ranchers are not allowed to put grazing lands in the soil bank. As the distinguished Senator knows, on three occasions I have sponsored amendments to make grazing lands eligible for the soil bank. Strangely enough, tame hay and crops planted each year to provide grazing are eligible for the soil bank. However, the grassland which nature gives us is not eligible. So it does not enter into the \$1,200,000,000 program, which allows the wheat farmer, the corn farmer, and other farmers to set aside a part of their acreage and be paid for not farming it.

But at the same time they are paid for not farming this acreage, what do they do with the land? They turn it into grassland, thus creating pasturelands which, in 2 or 3 years, will threaten with extinction the traditional and historic native grassland ranchers, those who have raised stock on what we call the short-grass areas. The grass does not grow back in a year. It will require 3 or 4 years. The land will have to be rested. It will require soil treatment—not merely that which is given to the ordinarily fertile areas which have plenty of rainfall, but reseeding. The people who depend upon the land for their very existence must be recompensated in some way. That is what the bill is designed to do, as I understand. In order to share in this program, they must reduce the number of cattle in their herds. Only if they do so can they be paid 50 cents or a dollar an acre.

It seems to me that this is a very just and equitable bill. I appreciate the sturdy support which the distinguished Senator from Florida has given it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I correctly understand, the bill provides \$30 million for the next 2 years. However, it is a 5-year bill. Would it be fair to say that



it is a \$75 million bill, rather than a \$30 million bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think that is fair, because that would mean that we must reach the conclusion that the drought will not be ameliorated. I do not know, and no one knows, whether or not it will be ameliorated. There is some indication that it may have been broken already in a very important part of the drought belt. We all hope that such is the case. No one knows.

There is no guaranty that the program will be completed in 5 years, because no one can foresee that. Instead of having an open-end bill, with no time of termination, and no assurance that subsequent Congresses would have an opportunity to study the reauthorizing legislation, we felt that a time limit should be imposed.

The original bill contained a minimum of 3 years, without any time limit. Upon very careful study and consideration, and after conferences with those in the Department who, we felt, knew most about the subject, the committee decided that it would be sounder to establish a limit of 5 years, rather than to have a minimum of 3 years, or to have a minimum of 3 years and a maximum of 5 years, because that would tend to indicate that we were committing everyone to a 3-year program, whereas the wording of the amended bill makes it clear that we recognize that there are differences between properties. Some of them have to be handled on a limited-use basis and others on a complete deferred-use basis. Still others, we hope, will be back to verdant green in much less than the 3 years' minimum prescribed in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Oklahoma made reference to the fact that the bill would be applicable only to those farmers who were reducing their herd. Where in the bill is there a provision which requires a farmer to reduce his basic herd?

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no such provision. Of course, when the farmer defers grazing and takes his cattle off the range, he must either dispose of them or find some other source of feed for them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is just another subsidy. There is nothing in the bill which would in any way require a reduction of the herd in order to participate in the program. And I not correct in that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The opposite side is that most people in this area have long ago reduced their herds anyway because of the feed situation. Instead of having an overpopulation of livestock in the area, I understand that the population is now very greatly reduced and, in many cases there is no basic herd left. Farmers who take their cattle off the range under the bill will, of course, have to dispose of them or find other feed.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for calling attention to what is a problem of national significance, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, in relating

history, emphasized with respect to his own State, which was a part of the Dust Bowl 25 years ago. I refer to a condition that existed not only in Oklahoma and Colorado, but extended through 10 States. A great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1937, 20 years ago, recommended that Congress, begin to take steps to treat this serious problem with a long-range plan and program. President Roosevelt recommended establishment of a territorial agency through which a Great Plains program could be developed.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has asked about the provisions of an appropriation bill passed a few years ago. It is true that some of it dealt with feed, and it is also true that some millions of dollars dealt with listing of the soil, both of which are programs that were recommended 25 years ago. We are dealing today with a measure of national importance. As the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma said, the soil of the West was blowing clear into the desks of Senators in Washington. That was said 20 years ago.

President Eisenhower made a tour of the critical area only a few weeks ago. Why? Because it was of national importance. Today we are dealing with stopgap, piecemeal legislation, just as we did a few weeks ago. I say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio—and I see also on the floor the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—that I have a bill, which is now in process of preparation, which will attempt to put into effect some long-range recommendations made 20 years ago. But today we are doing our best with stopgap measures to deal with the economic problems of the 10 States involved. Later we will have before Congress measures which will deal with the problem in broader and more proper perspective. In the meantime the Senator from Florida certainly has given us a very intelligent and penetrating analysis of what we are faced with today.

In my own State, as I tried to explain a short time ago, there are 36 counties in eastern Colorado which come under the provisions of Public Law 875. We have now asked for the inclusion of 10 more counties because of the recent 3-blizzards. The people in those countries do not want to be foreclosed. They are saying, "You are spending money all over the world. We do not want gifts of money. Just do not foreclose us."

I have not studied the proposed legislation as carefully as the Senator from Florida has studied it. But I believe that it will give the people of my State to whom the elements have not been kind an opportunity to get their feet under them again.

I should like to make one further observation. Twenty-five years ago some of the area affected by this measure was a devastated area. Then the rains came. Do the Senators know what happened? The area became a great revenue producer for the United States Treasury. As the Senator from Oklahoma has said, people who live in this area are hardy and tough. They are of pioneering stock. They were born to the area. Sometimes I wonder why they stay there. But

they do stay there. As the rains come, the land once again becomes a great revenue producer. In one county alone, which produced broom corn, the people paid thousands and thousands of dollars into the Treasury and today there is hardly anything left there. Today most of the cattle in that county have been destroyed.

A continuing and long-range program is needed for the hardy people of this vast and vital area. What we are doing today is providing temporary aid, and this is necessary legislation. But our next step must be a program to develop the economic health of the area in all periods, under all conditions, whether drought or rain.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Colorado has referred to the point about which I have great fear. He has described a new, special condition, which probably will need new and special help. My fear has been that a precedent will be established by the bill we are considering today. It will aid the grazer in Colorado. Colorado now has a special condition. If I voted for the bill under consideration, I would feel obliged to vote for a bill which the Senator from Colorado will ask to be passed to cope with his problem. I very deferentially say to the Senator from Florida that if I voted for the bill now pending before the Senate, when the next disaster comes—and God forbid that it should come—I would feel obliged to vote for special aid for special damages caused by new special conditions.

I predict the time will come when officials from Florida will be asking for special aid to reimburse the State for damages caused by a tornado or a hurricane.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would say, of course, that Florida is a part of the Union. Whenever we sustain damage or a disaster so great as to sweep us off our feet, we expect the generous people in the rest of the Union to recognize that fact. I am trying to recognize that fact now for areas in the western part of our country. That is not a new idea. We have had disaster relief legislation for some time. I recall some tremendous disasters which occurred on the Columbia River and in other sections of our country. In each case a generous Congress acted to provide some relief. A generous Congress acted very quickly, I may say, to give what relief could be provided. I may say, too, that any relief that can be given is always partial relief, because the area that is hit by disaster sustains most of the loss and damage and grief.

Later a great storm hit New England. I believe two great storms hit the New England area. Again, a generous Congress gave relief. That legislation was not passed under the leadership of New England legislators. It was passed because we realized that relief must be given to people who have been swept away from their moorings.

However, I do not believe that there has ever been any type of disaster which



in its long duration and in its impact, becoming first bad, and then worse, and then finally running almost to the ultimate, can be compared with this drought. Three years ago, as a member of a subcommittee, I visited the States of Kansas and Missouri and Arkansas and Texas. At that time the drought conditions were already very severe.

Once before on the floor of the Senate I referred to the time when the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and I tried to sleep in a certain north Arkansas community but were prevented from sleeping all through the night by the complaining of the cattle. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] rose and supplied me with a better word. He said it was the bawling of the cattle. So I use that word now.

So there have been disasters. In a country so large as ours, we shall continue to have disasters from time to time, but not every little disaster will call for Congressional action or recognition; the people can handle the small disasters themselves.

When Florida lost \$59 million in 1947 from a flood, we did not come to Congress and ask for restoration. Neither would the people of the great State of Ohio, who have had similar situations which have unfortunately arisen occasionally from floods on the Ohio River. That is not a hardship which Congress is asked to take care of.

But this is a devastation which has resulted from years of drought which have just about destroyed the productive capacity of a great area of the Nation. If Congress should sit idly by and do nothing about it, I think Congress would be much more heartless than it has been in the past when it was confronted with disasters in other parts of the country.

Mr. President, I have but a few more paragraphs in my statement. I shall read them rapidly. I apologize to the Senate for speaking at such great length. I had not intended to be on my feet so long when I started, but Senators have been generous in their comments. A statement which originally comprised but four and one-half pages has grown tremendously.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that the program provided for by the committee amendment will cost about \$30 million for the next 2 years. The committee changes, which provide for limited use as well as nonuse, payment rates based on the value of the use withheld rather than on average rental values, and many of the safeguards which I have discussed have reduced the cost of the program considerably from that which would be required by the bill as introduced. The revised bill should assure that full value in conservation should be obtained in return for the money spent on the program.

The committee amendment omits section 5 of the bill as introduced.

I call this especially to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who may have been temporarily misled by not knowing that that had been done.

Section 5 would have provided for the inclusion of protein feeds in the feed relief program carried out under section

2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress. The House struck an identical provision out of H. R. 2367 and we are advised that the House Committee on Agriculture intends to hold hearings on the matter covered by this section. We do not feel that the deferred grazing program, which is urgently needed, should be held up until these hearings can be held. Therefore the committee recommended that this section be omitted from the bill. It has been omitted in the committee substitute.

H. R. 2367, which covers the same subject as the pending bill, was passed by the House on February 6 and is now before the Senate Committee on Agriculture. When the Senate has concluded its consideration of S. 511 it is my intention to move to discharge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from further consideration of H. R. 2367 and proceed to its consideration. I shall then move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Senate-approved language of S. 511. Thereafter, I shall move to postpone indefinitely S. 511.

I hope the Senate may take speedy action on the committee amendment to S. 511.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are considering today a bill of extreme urgency. It is a measure intended to bring relief not only to drought-stricken farmers and ranchers but to precious soil assets which must be conserved for future generations.

The direct impact of this measure would be felt primarily in the great Southwest. That is the area which has born the brunt of the dry, parching years. But the beneficial effects of the bill will be felt by the whole Nation and by generations yet to come.

In simple terms, the bill would provide payments for deferred grazing at rates equal to the fair rental value of the land. The payments would apply only to non-federally owned land and to native range land.

There is a very practical basis for this measure. We are faced with the choice of either keeping the cattle, the sheep, and other stock off this land or losing for many decades to come soil resources which will be badly needed as our population continues to increase.

The farmers and ranchers cannot afford to take the stock off the land without some help. Drought is not only a physical disaster—it is an economic disaster which saps the financial lifeblood of every community.

If the stock remains on the land, the surface soil will be trampled and ground into a fine powder. It will blow away with the slightest breeze. Soon the land will become barren and sterile—fit for nothing except melancholy lectures on how we lacked wisdom.

It may be considered a paradox by those who live outside the drought area, but it is a fact, that the recent rains and snows have made the need for deferred grazing even more acute. The rains green up the ranges slightly and there is greater temptation to graze.

Such grazing is premature. It tends only to accelerate the rapid progress to complete disaster. The soil needs months—in some cases even years—of rest and gradual accumulation of water.

This situation is important not just to the people of the area, but to taxpayers and citizens throughout the Nation. The drought has brought difficulties to people as far removed from the Southwest as New York City, or Duluth, Minn.

According to the Wall Street Journal, recent increases in shrimp prices can be blamed in part on the reduced flow of fresh water into the Gulf of Mexico. The shellfish prefer less salty water in which to mature.

Drought-caused shortages have helped increase the price of some lawn grass seeds by as much as 20 percent. The whole farm-implement industry has suffered setbacks because farmers and ranchers cannot buy needed equipment.

And unless the soil is restored, we will—in the foreseeable future—face serious shortages of food and fiber.

People who have ranched for generations cannot pull up their roots overnight and move to other parts of the country. They cannot readily be absorbed into other parts of our economy.

But they are heavily saddled with debt already. Even if the rains continue, many of them will be keeping their books in red ink for the next several years.

Mr. President, there are ample safeguards against abuse in this bill. Payments to any one person would be limited to \$5,000 for land in any one county or land operated as a single unit.

There would be no payment if the shift of the stock resulted in overgrazing in nondeferred areas. Permits under the Taylor Grazing Act would be protected.

In reporting the bill, the committee struck out the section relating to high-protein feed. I consider this section of major importance, but I can understand the reasons for this action.

It was done to conform to the House, which wishes to hold further hearings on the subject.

The costs of this measure are low considering the benefits that would be returned to our Nation. The Agriculture Department estimates \$30 million for the next 2 years.

This is admittedly a temporary measure. It is intended to meet an emergency situation—but it is an emergency which could lead to untold suffering for our people.

Mr. President, on last Friday, April 5, the Wall Street Journal carried an excellent summary of the drought situation. It was written by James C. Tan-



ner. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tanner's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 5, 1957]

**DROUGHT DOUBT—DRENCHING RAINS AID SOUTHWEST, BUT WORST MAY BE YET TO COME—SOME FARMERS SHOP FOR NEW PLOWS BUT OTHERS FIGURE THEY NEED YEARS OF RAIN—MR. DEEDS BANKS ON A BANK**

(By James C. Tanner)

**PRITCHETT, COLO.**—Drenching rain and swirling snow have brought some relief and a little hope to the drought-stricken Southwest. But unless the rains continue, farmers, cattlemen, and bankers fear the worst may be yet to come.

Recent storms over broad sections of the Great Plains, including parts of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Kansas, have cheered many farm folk. In areas outside of the new Dust Bowl green grass and sprouting crops hint of ample harvests in the months ahead.

But in the heart of the drought area—stretching from lower west Texas to northern Colorado—the picture still is grim. The blizzards and rains have not provided the deep, prolonged soaking which farm experts say the soil needs over a period of months or even years.

Most farmers, farm experts, economists, and scientists across the drought belt share this view: Although the drought has been eased in some sections, its full, long-term effects are yet to be felt. So they're pushing irrigation, pondering pipelines, and studying ways to cut evaporation of water.

#### START OF THE SUFFERING

Should the drought continue, says Dr. A. B. Wooten, an economist at Texas A. & M. College, "suffering is just beginning." He believes that in such a case some farm families will be needing "direct relief" including groceries, clothing, and medical care.

What's in store for this area is important not only to the people who live here but also to taxpayers across the country who must pay the costs of Federal aid. Obviously affected too, are farm implement and auto makers.

The impact spreads to the Nation's consumers. Some small samples: Drought-caused shortages have helped boost the price of some lawn grass seed by 20 percent. And higher shrimp prices, resulting from shortened supplies, are blamed in part on the reduced flow of fresh water into the Gulf of Mexico. The shellfish prefer less salty water in which to mature.

Even if the increase in rainfall continues, chances are farmers and ranchers will be saddled with debt for the next 5 to 10 years, economists say.

#### DEATH AND DAMAGE

In some parched sections, the storms have hurt more than they have helped. They have whipped off topsoil and thin covers of grass, causing further damage to the land. Floyd Reed, Department of Agriculture statistician at Denver, estimates about half of the 2 million acres of winter wheat planted in Colorado will be abandoned. And reports from New Mexico indicate the recent blizzards left 10,000 cattle dead in 2 counties alone. State police and highway crews are pitching in to help ranchers remove and bury the dead animals, which are posing a pollution threat.

"Eastern Colorado is in worse shape by far than last year," grieves Colorado rancher Paul W. Swisher, State commissioner of agriculture. He believes 3 or 4 years of above-average precipitation is necessary to restore this year's normal agricultural life.

Here in the heart of the section of which Mr. Swisher speaks, Earl Deeds, a Pritchett farmer-rancher, says that unless the Federal Government steps in with long-term loans, more and more of his neighbors will be heading for city jobs. Buffeted by years of scarce rainfall and more recently by cattle-killing blizzards, many farm folk can't hold on much longer, he says.

#### LOOKING TO WASHINGTON

Farmer Deeds, a spry 68, figures it would require at least 2 to 3 years of plentiful rainfall for his land and equipment to recover. Meanwhile, he's relying on the soil bank—"a man can live off the soil bank even without a crop but he can't pay off a loan every year"—and looking to Washington for help in the form of long-term credit.

When he gets the rainfall he needs, Mr. Deeds plans to raise oats, barley, and wheat again on acreage now idled by the soil bank. He also will rebuild his purebred Hereford herd, diminished by the dry spell to some 80 head, about one-third its former size. His herd was reduced even further by the recent blizzards; he lost 8 animals, but some of his neighbors lost 100.

"But I'm not going to leave this land," vows Mr. Deeds. "I still think it's the best in the country."

Farm experts readily agree that the land is good—but they'll argue about what it's good for. Many soil scientists claim some 14 million acres of cultivated land in the drought sector should be turned to grass and used for grazing, with little attempt made to grow crops on it. Much is marginal land, they note, averaging less than 20 inches of rainfall annually even in normal years. Such is hardly sufficient for successful crop cultivation, they insist.

In the new Dust Bowl, an area larger than all of Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Rhode Island, winds this spring are kicking up dust from over 30 million acres of dried-out topsoil. The new Dust Bowl blankets that of two decades ago and spills over in all directions.

Soil conservationists warn that next year the damaged acreage will be even greater unless enough slow rainfall soaks the sun-baked earth.

"The ground in parts of Colorado is in such condition that it won't take water," notes a Denver soil conservationist glumly. "It will take 4 years of above average rainfall to bring this land back."

At Dallas, a bank economist declares: "We've mind out all the productive features of much of the soil. We'll have to allow a cooling-off period for a substantial portion, put it in grasses and leave it there for perhaps 5 years."

Agricultural officials report farmers are showing an increased awareness of the long-range problems presented by rainfall cycles, and a willingness to plan their operations accordingly. All through the southern half of the Great Plains more farmers are emphasizing diversification—in livestock as well as crops—and are pushing irrigation programs. They're building terraces, small ponds and dams so that rain, when and if it comes, can be trapped and held until it soaks into the thirsty soil.

#### PUTTING ON A CARPET

In south Texas, extensive root plowing is converting barren ground to grass-covered rangeland. Big tractors shove over brush and trees while knifing the earth. Seeder boxes on the back of each vehicle plant grass during the operation. The idea is threefold: To pit the ground so that it will hold the few drops of rain that fall, to rid the land of water-hungry trees, and to cover the earth with a carpet of grass.

In this section of the plains, farmers and ranchers are drawing their water from far

under the ground through elaborate systems of pumps and piping. But some hydrologists warn that such underground reservoirs, stored up over the centuries, will be exhausted within a few years if current heavy use continues.

On a more grandiose scale, Government planners are mulling schemes to construct vast canals and reservoirs in drought-parched regions of the Southwest. Leading Texans, for example, are weighing a proposed \$1 billion, 450-mile long canal running from the gulf coast through southern portions of the State. It would irrigate nearly a million acres.

Already underway is a 23-mile, \$40 million tunnel under the Rocky Mountains. To be ready by 1962, the project will divert water from the western slope of the Rockies to the Denver area on the east side.

#### WATER PIPELINE NETWORKS

"We can foresee the day when there will be networks of water pipelines criss-crossing this country in much the fashion that petroleum lines do today," says Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton. Furthermore, he says, atomic power may provide the energy to pump water over long distances and to desalt water already available in briny form.

Steps also are being taken to control evaporation, which costs Texans almost as much water as they use—eight million acre-feet a year.

At Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, scientists are applying a chemical film to small ponds, cutting evaporation in half. A waxy substance—hexadecanoid—spreads a thin film over the surface. Water which otherwise would be evaporated by the sun can be saved at an estimated cost of half a cent per thousand gallons, researchers claim.

Urban folk are as interested in these potential projects as their rural cousins. For the 8-year-old drought has been rubbing much of the bloom off what had been the Southwest's booming economy. "Texas was getting the big play on industrial expansion," says Dr. Harold Vagtborg, president of Southwest Research Institute. Now Louisiana is getting it.

Dr. Vagtborg frankly admits he'd like to see water diverted to industrial uses. "It takes as much water to support 1 farmer as 60 industrial workers." He claims, "If the industries are going to pull out because of lack of water let's look at the relationship of 60 to 1 and see what we come up with."

"Normal rainfall won't take care of our needs, particularly as we attract more industry," says Dr. Arthur Smith, vice president and economist at Dallas' First National Bank. The only thing for us to do is to go outside our borders for water.

The drought-spurred influx of farmers to metropolitan areas has only underscored the cities' own water shortages. Colorado agricultural commissioner Swisher, for instance, says his State is losing farm units at the rate of 1,000 or more a year.

"Over the short-run period the cities will be able to absorb this influx of farm people," asserts Dr. Philip Coldwell, Federal Reserve bank economist. "But whether this is true over a long period depends on whether the water problem is licked."

Most certainly, urban opportunities will continue in the drought belt despite water problems. Military payrolls, defense plants, and petroleum continue to pump dollars into city economies. In fact, many towns in areas of the Southwest where the drought's impact has not been too severe report steadily mounting economic activity.

In the fertile blackland belt of central Texas, for instance, many farmers figure they'll come up with normal crops this year because of early spring rains. And in the lower Rio Grande Valley, farmers have been withdrawing cotton acreage previously committed to the soil bank.



## WINDOW SHOPPING FARMERS

In some areas now emerging from the drought, merchants report farmers are window shopping for replacements for 10-year-old tractors and rusted plows.

"The situation is getting to look pretty rosy," enthuses K. L. Blood, Oklahoma City department of agriculture statistician.

Another sign of hope in parts of the Southwest: Many cattlemen, encouraged by recent rainfall and favorable forecasts by some weather experts, are pressing reluctant bankers for loans to restock depleted herds.

But the bankers are holding off to see if more rain is in sight. For instance, at Kerrville, Texas, where five inches of rain last month turned pastures green, banker A. J. Lochte says he won't be granting loans for restocking until new grass is strong enough to be grazed. "We've had quite an increase in requests for loans from smaller stockmen," says Mr. Lochte. "But the larger ranchers still are waiting until they're more certain."

At San Angelo, C. R. Hallmark, president of the First National Bank, also is being cautious about granting agricultural loans despite a recent light rain. "This drought isn't over yet," says Mr. Hallmark.

There are some, of course, who question whether the Great Plains cattle business—subject of much colorful prose and poetry—will ever again be a sizable factor in the Nation's livestock industry. The Nation's cattle population has shown a tendency in recent years to move eastward, and some Western cattlemen have moved with their herds.

"It's getting tougher all along to raise cattle in the old cowboy country," avers Dr. Smith, Dallas banker.

Western cattlemen will argue this point. "Good weather conditions will stabilize our herds," says a rancher at Truth or Consequences, N. Mex.

Despite a big increase in cattle production in Southeastern areas, the number of beef animals in the United States took a downturn this year. Continued drought likely will cause further reduction. If the drought country should have substantial rain this year or next, demand for replacement breeding animals probably will spur a new increase in total cattle population.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 2367, and this I do with the consent of the chairman of the committee. If permission is granted, I shall then move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 2367. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2367?

Mr. HOLLAND. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking out all after the

enacting clause of H. R. 2367 and inserting in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 511, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a member of the committee and as a Senator representing in part one of the States which is interested in programs of this particular kind, I wish to say that I supported this measure in the committee, and I feel that the amendments which were made by the Senate committee have strengthened the bill and certainly tend to justify unanimous support of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to have the Senate vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 2367) was passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program, which shall include nonuse or limited use, or any needed combination thereof, in any county affected by such disaster in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and finds that limited or deferred grazing is necessary and appropriate for the reestablishment or conservation of grass for grazing. Such program shall be applicable only to nonfederally owned land which is normally used for grazing. Within 30 days (1) after the date of enactment of this act, or (2) after any subsequent designation of any such area as a disaster area by the President, the Secretary shall designate the counties in any such area in which this program shall be available, and the program shall remain available in each such county for a period of not more than 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation. No payment shall be made under the program if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other land results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any

person for deferred grazing on land in any one county or land in more than one county operated as a single unit shall not exceed \$5,000 for any 1 year.

SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be supplemental to the agricultural conservation program, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made concurrently on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 511 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which House bill 2367 was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

To motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN CORN BASE ACREAGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 194, Senate bill 1771.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1771) to provide for a 1957 corn-base acreage of 51 million acres, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to announce that we do not contemplate any yeas-and-nays votes this evening, or any further business this evening, other than statements to the Senate and statements for the RECORD.

## PREMIER SHOWING OF THE MOTION PICTURE, WONDERS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on Friday, April 19, at the Trans-Lux Theater, in Washington, D. C., there will be the premier public showing of a great documentary motion picture entitled "Wonders of Washington."



A number of weeks ago I had the privilege of seeing a preview of this motion picture, and I think that by all odds it is the greatest inspirational motion picture ever made of the National Capital, its environs, and its activities. I do not pose as an expert in the field of the cinema; but in support of that opinion of mine, I should like to read several paragraphs from a letter written by Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America. In his letter he states that:

A good many efforts have been made over the years to capture Washington \* \* \* the Capital City \* \* \* on film.

It has always proved a hard and elusive subject, for Washington is not just Government, or marble buildings, or the White House, or the Congress. It is all these things, to be sure, but there is another quality, an intangible quality, a thing of the heart and

the spirit and the imagination. When this quality is missing the Washington story cannot be complete.

Now, at last, you of Columbia have hit the bull's-eye right in the middle \* \* \* with Wonders of Washington.

Mr. President, I think all of us who are so much a part of Government at the National Capital will enjoy seeing this unusually fine piece of photography and this great rendition of the activities in Washington, D. C.

#### INDICTMENTS AND CONVICTIONS OF EMPLOYEES AND FORMER EM- PLOYEES OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, 1949 THROUGH 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I wish to incorporate in the body of

the RECORD a report giving an itemized breakdown of the indictments and convictions of the employees and former employees of the Internal Revenue Service during the fiscal years 1949 through 1956.

This report is broken down both as to years and as to major offenses for which each was indicted, and shows that during this period 169 have been indicted for causes ranging from embezzlement, theft, bribery, extortion, et cetera, and of that number 125 have been convicted.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Employees or former employees of Internal Revenue Service indicted or convicted during fiscal years 1949 through 1956*

Major offense for which indicted	1949		1950		1951		1952		1953		1954		1955		1956		Total	
	Indicted	Convicted	Indicted	Convicted	Indicted	Convicted	Indicted	Convicted	Indicted	Convicted	Indicted	Convicted	Indicted	Convicted	Indicted	Convicted	Indicted	Convicted
Embezzlement and theft.....	6	6	5	4	8	9	11	10	6	5	9	7	10	10	5	6	60	57
Bribery and graft.....	3	1	10	9	2	1	4	2	4	3	3	3	5	3	4	3	35	25
Conspiracy.....			1		1	1	6	1	8	5		4	5	1	4		25	12
Extortion and threats.....	1		1	1	1	1	2		3	1		3	1		2		11	6
Fraud and false statements.....					1	1	4	3	8	3	1	1	7	5	3	2	24	15
Tax evasion.....							1		1	1		1					2	2
Perjury.....									1	1	1		1	1	2	1	5	3
Claims and services in matters affecting Government.....							3	1		1							3	2
Postal violations.....													1	1			1	1
Forgery.....															1	1	1	1
Narcotics violations.....															1	1	1	1
Total.....	10	7	17	14	13	13	31	17	31	20	14	19	30	21	22	14	168	125
Indictment dismissed.....								1		1		3		2		4		11
Acquitted.....				2		1		3		2		3		3		5		19
Pending trial:																		
July 1, 1948.....																	1	
June 30, 1956.....																		14
Total.....																	169	169

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EFFECT OF GOVERNMENTAL SPENDING AND TAXATION ON PRESERVATION OF OUR BASIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this intrusion upon the time and patience of the Senate is made with the greatest personal reluctance. Not only do I regret the nature of the subject which I propose to discuss, but also I hesitate to distract this body from its considerations of the pending business.

Yet, there is nothing of greater concern to all Americans than the preservation of their basic institutions in a sound and free economic climate; and without assurance of this protection, all our other labors are in vain. Indeed, it is my most sincere conviction that the whole future course of American liberty resides in our ultimate decision with

respect to the matter of governmental spending and taxation; and it is our decision, and no one else's as we seek to fulfill the confidence of the 170 million citizens of this country whom we have been elected to serve.

Let there be no misunderstanding, either, as to the political implications of my remarks. There are none. Just as I campaigned against waste, extravagance, high taxes, unbalanced budgets, and deficit spending in the recent Democratic administrations, so shall I also, if necessary, wage a battle of conscience and conviction against the same elements of fiscal irresponsibility in this Republican administration. In America we have no double standard of governmental soundness. What is bad under the leadership of one party cannot possibly be good under the leadership of the other.

It is, of course, with the deepest sorrow that I must pass such a judgment upon my own party. In most matters, the Republican record of the past 5 years has been exemplary. With little exception, we have remained true to the promises and pledges made in 1952. Until quite recently, I was personally satisfied that this administration was providing the responsible and realistic leadership so vital to the maintenance of a strong domestic economy which, in turn,

is a vital factor in maintaining world peace.

Now, however, I am not so sure. A \$71.8 billion budget not only shocks me, but it weakens my faith in the constant assurances we have received from this administration that its aim was to cut spending, balance the budget, reduce the national debt, cut taxes—in short, to live within our means and allow our citizens the maximum personal benefits from their economic endeavors.

Mr. President, the Republican Party is pledged by principle to strengthen the basic economy of this Nation by the achievement of these aims. To do otherwise constitutes a betrayal of the people's trust. Yet, here we have this abominably high budget request which is the epitome of inconsistency, when compared with statements made by me, by many of my colleagues in both Houses of the Congress, and by the President in 1952.

No faithful public servant, whether by personal philosophy or through fear of voter retaliation, would dare to subscribe to such a breach of confidence. I for one, have always feared these political spending sprees because I have never believed that our people were fundamentally receptive to the idea of government by bribe. It is true that after 20 years of New Deal-Fair Deal







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 11, 1957  
For actions of April 10, 1957  
85th-1st, No. 63

## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....17	Drought relief.....1	Plant pests.....8
Animal disease.....25	Employee training.....11	Postal service.....22
Appropriations.....4	Farm program.....18	Poultry.....31
Area development.....13	Flood control.....5	Reclamation.....8
Assistant Secretary.....16	Foreign aid.....4,10,19	Research.....28
CCC.....2,3	Forestry.....7,15	School lunch.....30
Cooperatives.....23,27	Feed grain.....3	Small business.....12
Corn.....9,20	Insect control.....8	Soil bank.....29
Cotton.....2	Lands.....8,32	Stockpiling.....2
Dairy.....26	Legislative program...8,16	Taxes.....14
Defense mobilization.....6	Marketing.....29	Transportation.....14
Deferred grazing.....1	Personnel.....11,21	Wheat quotas.....24

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate rejected corn bill. House concurred in Senate amendments to deferred grazing bill. Ready for President. House committee reported bills for sale of extra-long staple cotton from stockpile, and for relief from certain CCC claims on feed grain deliveries in emergency feed program. Sen. Kuchel inserted Secretary's Calif. speech.

## HOUSE

1. DROUGHT RELIEF. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H.R. 2367, to establish a deferred grazing program for drought-stricken areas. This bill is now ready for the President. p. 4915
2. COTTON. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H.J. Res. 172, providing for the withdrawal and transfer of 50,000 bales of domestically grown extra-long staple cotton from the critical stockpile to CCC for sale (H. Rept. 340). p. 4917
3. FEED GRAINS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H.R. 2486, to authorize the CCC to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program (H. Rept. 341). p. 4917
4. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Passman criticized the transfer of requests for foreign-aid funds between agency appropriation bills and "change the name by which the foreign-aid program is identified so as to hoodwink the American people as to what the program costs". p. 4875  
The Appropriations Committee was granted permission to file, by midnight Fri., Apr. 12, reports on three appropriation bills. p. 4909

5. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed without amendment H.R. 6092, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Merrimack River flood-control compact. pp. 4907-09
6. DEFENSE MOBILIZATION. Both Houses received from ODM a report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending Dec. 31, 1956, pursuant to sec. 304b of the Defense Production Act. pp. 4831, 4917
7. FORESTRY. Received a Comptroller General's report on the administration of forest management activities by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Portland, Oreg., area office as of Nov. 1956. p. 4917
8. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that H.R. 3476, to control plant pests, H.R. 5538, military land withdrawals bill, and H.R. 2146, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act, will be debated today. p. 4876

SENATE

9. CORN. Rejected S. 1771, to provide for a 1957 corn-base acreage of 51 million acres, by a vote of 35 ayes to 45 nays (pp. 4840-67). Sens. Hickenlooper, Thye, Humphrey, Martin, Ellender, Case of S.D., Carroll, Malone, Young, Carlson, Holland, Mundt, Aiken, Dirksen, and Potter debated the bill. Sen. Ellender inserted the Secretary's report on the present status of the corn acreage reserve program, and letters from the Farmers' Union, Farm Bureau, and the National Grange on the corn bill (pp. 4854-5); and inserted tabulations showing soil bank operations (pp. 4856-7). Sen. Potter offered an amendment to exempt producers from penalties for wheat raised and used on the farm for feed or seed, which was modified by Sen. Young limiting the referendum to farmers with allotments over 15 acres or who plant over 15 acres and excluding farmers who are exempt from quotas due to use of their entire crop for feed or seed on the farm; and the amendment was then withdrawn by Sen. Potter (pp. 4863-6). Sen. Humphrey inserted correspondence with Assistant Secretary McLain and a letter from Minn. Gov. Freeman relative to corn legislation. (pp. 4866-7).
10. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Smith, N. J., inserted Secretary of State Dulles' statement before the Special Committee to Study the Foreign Aid Program in which he urged separation of military and economic aid, and establishment of a loan fund without prior allocations by country; with an editorial of the New York Times supporting the proposal. pp. 4838-40
11. PERSONNEL. Began consideration of S. 1832, to authorize the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of State, which became its unfinished business. pp. 4831, 4867-8

As reported (see Digest 61) S. 385, to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, provides as follows:

That appropriations or other funds available for salaries or expenses shall also be available for authorized training; that tuition, fees, and similar related expenses may be paid to the training institution or to the trainee; that no agency funds shall be available to pay for training at any facility that teaches or advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; that no training shall be provided under the bill for any employee unless authorized by the head of the agency or his duly designated representative; that regulations pursuant to the bill shall be issued by the President and shall set forth obligations to which employees given training under the bill shall agree; that any trainee failing to fulfill these obligations shall be required to reimburse the Government for the expense of the training to the extent the head of the agency finds equitable; that



Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.  
Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman made any exception in his bill for hunting knives as such?

Mr. YATES. I have, indeed. In my statement I discuss the exceptions that would be made in the bill for members of the Armed Forces, for example; for surgeons who have certain types of instruments that fall within the definition; for hunters, but with the provision that hunters who use knives of this type must register their use, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. For information purposes, is it not a fact that most of the States now have State laws that make it a violation for a person to have possession of a knife of the character the gentleman has been describing?

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I know that is true down in Texas.

Mr. YATES. I have not completed my study, but I know that is true in respect to many of the States.

Mr. FISHER. I think the gentleman is performing a very fine service in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress and the country. Certainly it is dealing with a subject that needs to be dealt with. Since this is per se a deadly weapon, and is so recognized in most of the States, it seems to me it would be a fine thing to prohibit the movement of it in interstate commerce. As I understand, that is what the gentleman proposes.

Mr. YATES. That is the purpose of the bill. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I join those who have complimented the gentleman on his action today because I believe he has pointed the way for an Act that is very much needed. The gentleman is to be congratulated for his work on it.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

#### DEFERRED GRAZING PROGRAM

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program, which shall include non-

use or limited use, or any needed combination thereof, in any county affected by such disaster in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and finds that limited or deferred grazing is necessary and appropriate for the reestablishment or conservation of grass for grazing. Such program shall be applicable only to nonfederally owned land which is normally used for grazing. Within 30 days (1) after the date of enactment of this act, or (2) after any subsequent designation of any such area as a disaster area by the President, the Secretary shall designate the counties in any such area in which this program shall be available, and the program shall remain available in each such county for a period of not more than 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

"Sec. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation. No payment shall be made under the program if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other land results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county or land in more than one county operated as a single unit shall not exceed \$5,000 for any 1 year.

"Sec. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be supplemental to the agricultural conservation program, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made concurrently on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program.

"Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POAGE and Mr. HILL were given permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. POAGE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

[Mr. HILL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, IN CONGRESS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago today at a special election in the 10th Congressional District of Texas the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON was elected to the House of Representatives.

During these years Senator JOHNSON has made for himself an outstanding record of achievement.

While Senator JOHNSON was serving in the House of Representatives he was elected to the United States Senate. A very unusual honor came to him during his first term. He was elected by his Democratic colleagues as minority leader in the United States Senate. At that time he was the youngest Member of that great body who had ever received this high honor. In addition, when the Democrats came into power in the 84th Congress he was elected by the Democrats as majority leader in the United States Senate. Another record was broken in that he was the youngest United States Senator to ever receive this great honor.

Senator JOHNSON has gotten along with his colleagues because of his fine basic virtues and good commonsense, that he has always possessed and used intelligently. Informed people marvel at the way he gets along in such a satisfactory and effective way with the most extreme liberals and the most reactionary conservatives. I personally believe it is due to the fact that he not only is an educated, cultured gentleman, who enjoyed and experienced the best environments as he grew to manhood, but also because he is a man of courage, sincerity, and honesty of purpose. He can disagree with a friend without offending his friend, even though his views are diametrically opposed. He expresses his views in such a sincere, forthright manner, with great respect to those who oppose him, that he is able to differ with those with whom he must agree without giving offense or becoming involved in a controversy.

It happens that I have known LYNDON JOHNSON all of his life. When I was serving in the Texas Legislature in 1921-24, I had the honor of being the desk-mate of his distinguished father, who was recognized as a great and able statesman. I have known, of course, the other members of his fine family, including his wonderful mother, his charming wife, who is really my constituent, and his attractive daughters, so I know something about LYNDON JOHNSON and can speak from actual knowledge about his real worth, ability, and accomplishments.

Before he was a Member of the House, he was the director of the staff of Congressman Richard Kleberg of Texas. This experience was, doubtless, helpful to him as he was one of the most active secretaries on Capitol Hill. He immediately organized the first Secretaries' Club and became its first president.

The National Youth Administration was organized. President Franklin D. Roosevelt called Senator JOHNSON to his office and asked him to become the director of this great organization for the State of Texas. As the youngest director of this new movement, he set out to do a real job and all the people of Texas are proud of his pioneering accomplishments in that educational field. By reason of his intense activity, which led to disseminating information about the program, more young men and young women took advantage of the opportunities offered under the National Youth Administration in Texas, and, therefore,



received greater benefits from it than the young men and women from any other State under comparable circumstances. Thousands of young people are indebted to him for making such an unusual success of such a forward and venturesome program.

After his election as a Member of the House, Senator JOHNSON became enthusiastically interested in rural electrification. At that time, only about 2 percent of the rural homes in Texas had the privilege of enjoying this great blessing of mankind. By reason of Senator JOHNSON's efforts, the district he had the honor to represent was soon electrified almost 100 percent, including farms and ranches in remote sections.

It has often been said that the four greatest evils are poverty, ignorance, disease, and crime. I think another great evil is real close; it is drudgery. Rural electrification relieved the men and women of the farms and ranches of drudgery by having electricity perform their back-breaking duties. REA from a national standpoint has meant a lot to this country. It created a market for, and actually caused the purchase of more than \$15 billion in electrical equipment and appliances. This is a market that manufacturers, retailers and others would not have enjoyed without REA. It is a continuing market, not only for manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, but also for banks, finance companies, mechanics, electricians and many people in the different trades and professions. The program was fortunate in having such farsighted leaders with energy and enthusiasm as Senator JOHNSON to make the program a great success. Another great national leader, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, was the author and sponsor of the bill, which became law, creating the Rural Electrification Administration.

Another important program Senator JOHNSON has taken the lead in concerns water. Several years ago, he caused the Reclamation Department to make a comprehensive study of water resources in Texas. He is one public official who was able to see into the future and realize the great need for water conservation and more intelligent water use. Senator JOHNSON's program has been to get at least one major dam started in Texas each year. I believe he has succeeded 100 percent; that means that there is one being finished each year. This year—1957—the Ferrell's Bridge Dam and Reservoir, near the birthplace of his helpful wife, will be completed. It will be a great addition to the resources of that fine section of the country. It is near Jefferson and Marshall, Tex.

I could say much more about Senator JOHNSON, but I just want to point out at this time these particularly important events in his life and his outstanding achievements that mean so much to all the people of our country. Here's hoping that he will have many, many more anniversaries in the United States Congress. All the people profit from the activities and accomplishments of such a great statesman as our majority leader of the United States Senate, about whom we cannot say too much in praise—the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

## UNRESTRICTED IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL OIL AND CHEAPLY MANUFACTURED FOREIGN GOODS IS A MENACE TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

## PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago yesterday the world saw Philippine-American friendship sealed in blood in Bataan. American and Filipino troops fought side by side against a common enemy. They fought as allies united by a common ideal. That they were of two different races was of no moment at all. They were bound by the ideal of freedom and they fought together to preserve the spiritual values paramount in the democratic way of life.

That Bataan fell before superior forces enhances rather than diminishes the significance of that determination of Philippine-American epic defense. The courage and the heroism shown in Bataan are a tribute to our men who fought to the end, knowing that they were outgunned, outplaned, outmanned 10 to 1. This showed moral and physical valor of the highest order and our two grateful nations turn our reverential thoughts to them today.

It is therefore fitting and proper that yesterday the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines should have commemorated the fall of Bataan with two significant statements printed in today's morning papers.

The President of the United States said:

On behalf of the people of the United States, I send Bataan Day greetings to our friends in the Philippines. Bataan Day is a solemn day for both nations, for it is a time when we pause to remember the price, and consider the meaning of freedom.

To try to recapture in words the deeds of the men of Bataan is not possible. By their action they expressed the true spirit of freedom better than words could ever do. That spirit is what we commemorate today.

We also commemorate the comradeship which has bound our two nations together so strongly in the past, and which continues to be so vital in the anxious present.

The dangers which now confront us are in a sense just as real as those that were faced on Bataan 15 years ago. So we continue to draw upon the spirit of devotion, of comradeship and of courage which is the noble legacy of Bataan.

The President of the Philippines said:

On this April 9 we are commemorating the 15th anniversary of the fall of Bataan. On behalf of the people of the Philippines I send our best wishes to you and to the people of the United States.

Bataan will always stand in our history as a symbol of a heart-rending struggle by the peoples of two nations fighting side by

side for the common goal of liberty, freedom, and democracy.

We are pledged that the spirit of Bataan shall not perish and that those gallant American and Filipino heroes who died for democracy shall not have died in vain.

Today our two peoples are fighting the more subtle enemy, communism, which is trying to subvert the ideals we fought for on Bataan.

The Filipino people know well the benefits of liberty and freedom and will continue to fight with the great spirit exemplified on Bataan to preserve those ideals.

In Washington, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States and representative on the U. N. Security Council, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who in Bataan was the aide-de-camp to General MacArthur and was therefore one of the active participants in that unequalled struggle, said:

Those who fought in Bataan did not equivocate. They staked their lives for freedom. There was no neutralism in the murk and mire of the foxholes. There were no fence-sitters there. This is the moral of Bataan.

President Carlos P. Garcia, in saying that "the Filipino people know well the benefits of liberty and freedom and will continue to fight with the great spirit exemplified on Bataan to preserve those ideals," spoke as one who, during those eventful days, preferred to take to the hills and suffer all sorts of hardships and privations rather than collaborate with the enemy, thus showing the same moral courage exemplified by the heroes of Bataan. Like the late President Magsaysay who fought as a guerrilla and like thousands of Filipinos in the resistance movement, these men showed endurance, fortitude, and incorruptibility that we Americans recognize with admiration and will never forget.

Yesterday was a day of remembrance and gratitude.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. UTT from April 15 to April 18, 1957, inclusive, on account of official business.

Mr. VINSON for 10 days on account of important business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN, for 15 minutes, on Tuesday next.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. YATES, for 20 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PORTER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL and to include an editorial.

Mr. PERKINS and to include an editorial.







Public Law 85-25  
85th Congress, H. R. 2367  
April 25, 1957

AN ACT

71 Stat. 26.

To establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program, which shall include nonuse or limited use, or any needed combination thereof, in any county affected by such disaster in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and finds that limited or deferred grazing is necessary and appropriate for the reestablishment or conservation of grass for grazing. Such program shall be applicable only to nonfederally owned land which is normally used for grazing. Within thirty days (1) after the date of enactment of this Act, or (2) after any subsequent designation of any such area as a disaster area by the President, the Secretary shall designate the counties in any such area in which this program shall be available, and the program shall remain available in each such county for a period of not more than five years after the date of enactment of this Act.

Agriculture.  
Grazing pro-  
gram.  
64 Stat. 1109.  
42 USC 1855-  
1855g.

SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation. No payment shall be made under the program if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other land results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county or land in more than one county operated as a single unit shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

Payments.

SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be supplemental to the agricultural conservation program, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made concurrently on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program.

Conditions.

71 Stat. 26.

Appropriation.

42 USC 1855-  
1855g.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

Approved April 25, 1957.